Producing a Culture of Inclusion:
Inclusive Refugee Education for Syrian Refugee Youth in Jordan

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Elisheva Leah Cohen

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Frances Vavrus and Dr. Roozbeh Shirazi, Co-Advisers

May 2019

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude for the many people who offered me support, guidance, encouragement, and compassion throughout this journey. It was a long and winding road, and I was fortunate to traverse it with so many friends, family members, and colleagues by my side.

First and foremost, I am extremely grateful to the Forseh Tanieh (FT) teachers and students at the three centers I visited who participated in this research. I was so lucky to work with kind and caring students who motivated me to be the best teacher I could be. You welcomed me into your school community and made me feel at home. I am so grateful to have gotten to know you all and for your willingness to share your stories with me. I would like to especially thank Dana, Ghofran, and Jenan, and their families, for welcoming me into their homes. I was also privileged to spend my time with teachers who worked tirelessly to provide their students, both Jordanians and refugees, with a quality education in a safe and supportive environment. In particular, I am grateful for the support of the teachers and staff at the Hashemite Youth Center: you welcomed me into your place of work with open arms, allowed me to observe your teaching, and graciously answered questions and helped me understand FT. Your tireless dedication to your students is inspiration for this work. I am also indebted to the administration of FT who allowed me to conduct this study, generously gave their time to make this study possible, and provided me guidance and insight along the way. The work you do is so valuable and I was privileged to be a part of it.

I am exceedingly fortunate to have worked under the mentorship of two brilliant scholars and supportive advisors, Frances Vavrus and Roozbeh Shirazi. You both pushed me to make this work better by offering valuable feedback, asking good questions, and providing advice and direction throughout the doctoral process. I am grateful for the time and energy you spent reviewing my work and providing detailed feedback that made my arguments stronger and my writing clearer. Beyond this dissertation, you both provided invaluable mentorship over my time at the University of Minnesota that helped me better understand academia, the field of Comparative and International Education, and ways to navigate a work-life balance. I am deeply grateful to my other two dissertation committee members, Joan DeJaeghere and Sarah Dryden-Peterson. You both provided meaningful support throughout the research and writing process and guided my work in important ways.

The University of Minnesota community has nurtured my growth as a scholar and made it possible for me to get to this point. I am grateful for the faculty at the U who have taught me and guided me over the past five years: Cawo Abdi, Melissa Anderson, Chris Johnstone, Karen Miksch, Sarah Parkinson, and Rebecca Ropers-Huilman. I want to thank Jeremy Hernandez and Linda Elrich for all their help navigating the administrative bureaucracy of the U. I would not have made it through two years of coursework and exams without the support and comradery of my amazing cohort: Emily Dahdah, Emily

Morris, Ferdinand Chipindi, Hassan Hussein, Jenny Ernie-Steighner, Kristeen Chachage, Maurice Sikenyi, Richard Bamattre, and Theresa Heath. For all the hours you spent talking through big ideas with me and reviewing my written work, as well as countless coffees, lunches, and dinners-thank you. To the amazing women who helped make Minnesota feel like home: Zhuldyz Amankulova, Anna Farrell, Sammy Holquist, Anna Kaiper, Felicia Karas, Sara Kemper, Kate Koehler, Orkideh Mohajeri, Joanna Tzenis, and Laura Wangsness-Willemsen. Your friendship has meant so much to me.

I want to thank the following organizations and institutions for their financial support: The Jordan American Commission for Educational Exchange (Fulbright, Jordan); the National Academy of Education and Spencer Foundation; the Philanthropic Education Organization (PEO); the University of Minnesota Graduate School; The University of Minnesota College of Education and Human Development; the Women's Philanthropic Leadership Circle of CEHD.

During the year I spent conducting fieldwork in Jordan, I was supported by so many people who joined me in celebrating accomplishments and overcoming challenges. The Fulbright Jordan staff, Alain McNamara, Iman Abdul Wahid, Lara Shadid, Aya al-Abdallat, and Mohammad al-Ahmad, helped me understand cultural nuances of the country and navigate the many bureaucracies that exist within Jordan. The Fulbrighters provided a warm and caring community that made the year enjoyable. In particular, I want to give a huge shout-out to: Addie Leak, Anna Belle Newport, Emilia Truluck, Emily Robbins, Gabby Young, Maddie Ulanow, Miriam Hauser, and Nina Angeles. I am also grateful for my three tutors, Jenan, Balqees al-Noubni and Ahmad Taha. They helped me achieve a level of proficiency that enabled me to conduct this research. They did so while also providing important cultural insights, friendship, and loads of patience. I am also grateful for Riad and Suhaib who helped me get around Jordan safely, always arrived on time, never smoked, and navigated to obscure and far-off destinations without addresses or maps.

The National Academy of Education/Spencer Foundation also provided essential support for this dissertation. In addition to financial support, the two Spencer retreats and the NAEd/Spencer 2017 community were instrumental in providing skills and knowledge as well as motivation and confidence to complete this dissertation. I am especially grateful for the NAEd/Spencer administrators, Maria Gahan and Abby Bell, for all their hard work in administering our awards and organizing the retreats. I want to thank my two faculty mentors, Kathleen Hall and Ritty Lukose, who provided insight into my work and guidance for moving forward. Finally, thank you to all the fellows who provided a warm community to engage in deep academic thought, while also giving ample time to fawn over Ava.

This work—and my skills as a scholar—have been greatly strengthened by many other scholars and academics who deserve mention here. They include: Carine Allaf, Elizabeth Adelman, Lesley Bartlett, and Diana Rodriguez Gomez. The writing of this dissertation would not have happened without the guidance of Cathy Mazak and the support and

encouragement of the Academic Women's Writing Collective. Similarly, I could not have produced this work without the ongoing academic and parenting support and guidance from the Facebook group, Academic Mamas with Babies Born in 2017.

I am lucky to have close friends who supported me through this academic journey. Michal Raucher was a constant source of guidance, inspiration, encouragement, solace, and laughter. I am so grateful for her scholarly insights, her unconditional encouragement, and her ongoing friendship. Miriam Manon and Noa Lunday helped keep my spirits high through our weekly FaceTime chats.

This dissertation would not have been written without the amazing care-taking talent of Kim Willemsen Wollfe. Knowing that Ava was being loved, cared for, and receiving so many huggies from Kim, Tova, and Sam enabled me to spend hours writing without worry.

This dissertation—and the entire PhD journey—would not have happened without the love, support, and encouragement of my family. My parents, Phil Cohen and Betsy Gamburg, encouraged me to pursue my academic interests from a young age and continue to offer encouragement and support today. They taught me the value of asking questions, listening to others, and giving time to reflect. Thank you for always believing in me. To my sister, Talia: thanks for all FaceTime fun, endless desserts including homemade fudge and caramel, and for being such a great sister and aunt. Shunya, Lilia, and Polina—and the entire Roytman clan—have been supportive of me as I pursued this path. Thank you.

Finally, I cannot express in words the invaluable roles played by both my amazingly supportive unicorn of a husband, Arkady Roytman, and my daughter, Ava Ruth Cohen Roytman. Arkady-none of this would have happened without you. You have been unwavering in your support for me from the very beginning: you helped me study for the GREs; you didn't flinch when I told you I wanted to move to Minnesota; you spent hours entertaining conversations about poststructural epistemology and critical theory; you eagerly embarked upon a year-long journey in Jordan and rarely complained even when it was tough; and you spent so many hours watching Ava—even with bronchitis—so that I could sit in Whole Foods and write. You always believed in me, even when I doubted myself, and you found the perfect balance of pushing me to keep working and reminding me to take breaks. Ava: you bring me so much joy, which has helped to balance out the challenges and stress of writing a dissertation. Your presence motivated me to persist and persevere. I love you both so much.

Abstract

In its 2012-2016 Global Education Strategy, the UNHCR introduced a new paradigm of refugee education that called for inclusive refugee education. In this model of schooling, refugees study the curriculum of the host country, from local teachers and, often, alongside local students. While this model of refugee education is upheld for its potential to provide high quality education for all students, limited research of this context shows refugees experience discrimination and harassment in these spaces (Bellino & Dryden-Peterson, 2018; Mendenhall, Russell, Buckner, 2017).

Following the outbreak of conflict in Syria in 2011, over 650,000 Syrians sought safety and protection in Jordan. Over 80 percent of those refugees live in urban areas, and almost half of them are school-aged (UNHCR, 2019). To accommodate the educational needs of Syrian refugee children and youth, the Government of Jordan provides inclusive refugee education such that Syrian refugees attend Jordanian schools and learn the Jordanian curriculum from Jordanian teachers, often alongside Jordanian students.

This dissertation draws on 12 months of ethnographic research to examine the processes and practices of inclusive refugee education and the cultural production of "inclusion" that occurs within the educational space of Forseh Tanieh, a non-formal educational program in Jordan. Through this dissertation I advance two arguments. First, I argue that inclusive refugee education holds potential to serve as a space to foster inclusion among refugee and national students. I suggest that the flexible and supportive conditions of non-formal education enable students and teachers to engage in an ongoing process of cultivating, navigating, and contesting inclusion of refugees. Second, I contend that despite its potential, inclusive refugee education is not immune to the social, cultural, political, and economic struggles taking place in society and that these struggles structure and constrain teachers' and students' understanding of and approaches to the production of inclusion. Based on my findings, I propose a theory of inclusion in the context of inclusive refugee education that conceptualizes it as an ongoing process that is continually being constructed, navigated, and negotiated by multiple education actors whose interactions in the classroom reflect unequal relations of power in wider Jordanian society.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Acronyms

3RP	Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
EFA	Education for All
EPC	Education Program Coordinator
ERfKE	Education Reform for the Knowledge Economy
ESWG	Education Sector Working Group
FT	Forseh Tanieh
GoJ	Government of Jordan
HQ	Headquarters
HYC	Hashemite Youth Center
JRP	Jordan Response Plan
LSS	Learning Support Services
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MoE	Ministry of Education
MOPIC	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NFE	Non-Formal Education
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UNRWA	United Nations Relief Works Agency

Chapter One: Inclusive Refugee Education in Jordan

During the year I spent conducting ethnographic field work with Forseh Tanieh[1] (FT), an organization offering non-formal education (NFE) in Jordan, I volunteered to teach English for a different organization that supported Syrian refugees. My class included two female high school students from Syria: Nour and Hiba. They were close friends who attended Jordanian public school together. As I discuss later in this chapter, the Government of Jordan (GoJ) responded to the influx of Syrian refugees beginning in 2011 by opening its schools to Syrian refugee children and youth. The inclusion of refugee children in the Jordanian national education system aligns with the Global Education Strategy (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 2012), the UN agency with the mandate to protect refugees. The Global Education Strategy established a new paradigm of refugee education, inclusive refugee education, that prioritizes the "integration of refugee learners within national systems" (UNHCR, 2012, p. 8). Nour and Hiba, the two girls in my English class, spoke frequently about their schooling experiences in Jordan. In our conversations, they revealed experiencing discrimination, violence, and bullying from their Jordanian peers and teachers. Jordanian students insulted them, called them derogatory names, and often resorted to physical violence. In an interview with Nour and Hiba, they told me this story:

> When the problem started, we were just sitting in the classroom and a Syrian girl was putting on mascara. A Jordanian came up to her and told her, you're not a

[1] Forseh Tanieh is a pseudonym. Throughout the dissertation, I use pseudonyms for all people and many organizations to protect anonymity.

> good girl, you don't have any manners, why are you putting on makeup? Stuff like that. Her sister tried to defend her and the Jordanian girl just started cursing at Syria. Saying really nasty things, and telling us that the Syrians in Jordan were the garbage of Syria. Finally, we couldn't take it anymore and so we went to try to help. We wanted to solve the problem diplomatically using words, but it didn't work, and they started beating us up. There were teachers standing there, but they didn't interfere. If they did, they probably would have gotten fired. (Interview, May 17, 2017)

These sorts of anecdotes, which I heard from other Syrian students I got to know during my research, are reaffirmed by other scholars' research, which finds ongoing bullying of Syrian refugee youth by peers and discrimination by teachers (Ahmadazeh et al., 2014; Education Sector Working Group, 2015; Human Rights Watch, 2016; Salem, 2018).

And yet, through my research with Syrian refugee youth at FT, I heard a very different story, one that focused on inclusion and acceptance. Isra, for example, a 16 year old student at FT came to Jordan from Syria in 2012. Her parents withdrew her from public school education because of the verbal and physical harassment she experienced by Jordanian students. She enrolled in the FT NFE program, a two-year accelerated learning program for Syrian and Jordanian students that culminated in a certificate of completion from the Jordanian MoE. In 2018, about 40 percent of FT students were Syrian (personal communication, March 13, 2018). Isra loved coming to the FT program and looked forward to seeing her Syrian and Jordanian friends. In the morning before classes started, I often saw Isra huddled with her girl friends talking and giggling, reluctant to take their seats when class began. When I asked her about the discrimination

and bullying that I had heard about in the public schools, she explained that while she did experience this in public schools, she never saw it at the FT center. She was confident that if anything like that did happen in FT, the other students and teachers would support her and help her. She expressed delight at being back in an educational context, especially one that would result in a certificate. She appreciated the caring nature of her teachers and the attention they gave to her learning, and she enjoyed getting to spend time socializing with students from multiple backgrounds. She felt this inclusive context gave Jordanians and Syrians opportunities to "learn about each other and meet each other. Being in the same class with Jordanians is better because you can talk about your experiences and your feelings" (interview, April 12, 2017). While Isra dreamed of eventually returning to Syria, she loved her experience at the FT center. During our interview, Isra told me: "I wish I could take the FT center back with me to Syria" (interview, April 12, 2017).

These two stories—one from the formal school system and one from the FT NFE system—illustrate very different experiences of inclusive refugee education. The experiences of exclusion and discrimination that Nour and Hiba faced in public schools represent a common narrative of refugee education in Jordan. Indeed, as I explained earlier, Syrian refugee children and youth face high levels of discrimination, harassment, and bullying in the public school system, a key factor affecting their schooling experiences that contributes to dropout decisions among Syrian children and youth (Sieverding et al., 2018). In fact, it is a common story heard from refugees around the world: despite efforts of inclusion, refugees in inclusive educational spaces face ongoing levels of discrimination (Dryden-Peterson, 2015; Mendenhall, Russell, Buckner, 2017).

We hear stories like Isra's, of inclusion and friendship, much less frequently. However, as refugee education turns increasingly towards the model of inclusive refugee education, in alignment with the UNHCR education strategy, Isra's story is worth deeper investigation. What does the practice of inclusive refugee education look like in FT? How do the practices and processes of inclusive refugee education shape educational experiences? Does inclusive refugee education cultivate a culture of inclusion and, if so, how? And, importantly, is FT truly as inclusive as Isra makes it out to be?

While Isra and many of the other Syrian refugee youth I came to know through my research expressed feeling a sense of inclusion in FT, I began to wonder what was meant by inclusion and what was actually produced in the space of inclusive refugee education. I noticed subtle and nuanced actions and practices on the part of the Jordanian students and teachers that told a slightly different story. It is true that I never saw or heard direct discrimination or physical violence towards Syrian refugees at FT; however, I did hear Jordanian students express resentment towards the presence of Syrian refugees, although often it was phrased as slight irritation or mild animosity. I also saw subtle ways in which teachers singled out the refugee youth, highlighting their status as outsiders. I observed multiple practices on the parts of both Jordanian students and teachers that, in subtle and nuanced ways, reinforced and legitimized their positions as culturally dominant over Syrian refugees. Yet, I also saw Syrian students draw on their transnational lives to construct meanings of inclusion that fit their realities, in a sense shaping and presenting themselves in particular ways within a space designed to be inclusive. Thus, it became clear that while there was an absence of direct violence and outright discrimination, the FT center was not a neutral site; rather, the educational space

was deeply intertwined with the broader society and a site that was both shaped by and in contestation with the dominant social, political, and economic fabric of society (Apple, 2010).

This dissertation examines the processes and practices of inclusive refugee education and the cultural production of "inclusion" that occurs within this education space. I analyze the processes and practices of inclusive refugee education in the space of FT and the ways that Syrians and Jordanians engage with them to construct and navigate a sense of inclusion. I illustrate ways that education actors—students and teachers, Jordanians and Syrians—draw upon the broader social and cultural environment and the discourses and ideologies that circulate to produce and negotiate inclusion and exclusion for refugee youth. I give attention to the agency that education actors assert in constructing and navigating inclusion and exclusion in the face of systemic and structural constraints. A small number of scholars have investigated refugee education (and education for im/migrants more broadly) through this critical lens, theorizing on the ways in which education serves as a site of social or political struggle, particularly around issues of inclusion and exclusion. The theoretical conceptualizations of refugee education and issues of inclusion/exclusion will be explored further in this chapter

Drawing on the findings from my year-long ethnographic study, I advance two primary arguments. First, I argue that inclusive refugee education holds potential to serve as a space to foster inclusion among refugee and national students. Based on the experiences of inclusive refugee education at FT and the flexible and supportive conditions it offers, I suggest non-formal education, in particular, enables students and

teachers to engage in an ongoing process of cultural production to cultivate, navigate, and assert a culture of inclusion for refugees.

Second, I contend that while inclusive refugee education holds the potential to serve as a space to foster inclusion among refugee and national students, those who advocate for inclusion of refugees must recognize that inclusive educational spaces are not immune to the social, cultural, political, and economic struggles taking place in society at large. Even in cases like FT where national and refugee students build friendships and teachers provide social and emotional support to their refugee students, the production of inclusion in the classroom is also structured and constrained by national teachers' and students' exclusionary discourses that position refugees as burdensome to the host country. Therefore, scholars and practitioners of refugee education must attend to the ongoing and nuanced ways that both refugee students, national students, and teachers navigate and negotiate educational processes to construct inclusion and exclusion. Based on these findings, I propose a theory of inclusion in the context of inclusive refugee education that conceptualizes it as an ongoing process that is continually being constructed, navigated, and negotiated by multiple education actors whose interactions in the classroom reflect unequal relations of power in wider Jordanian society. My goal is to contribute to a more critical understanding of refugee education in countries of first asylum as it takes place in this new paradigm of inclusive refugee education.

Situating the Study in the Field of Refugee Education

In the past twenty years, the international community has placed increasing emphasis on the practice of refugee education, asserting it is a fundamental human right

that is guaranteed to all children and a priority for refugee communities themselves (Dryden-Peterson, 2011; Sinclair, 2001). The right to education for refugees is upheld in numerous legal frameworks and policy documents, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the most widely ratified international human rights document (Sinclair, 2001). Refugee education has also been upheld for its capacity to provide physical, emotional, and psychological protection for refugees. Scholars assert that while children demonstrate great resiliency, they need supportive structures and individuals to reinforce their natural resilience (Loughry & Eyber, 2003; Save the Children Alliance, 1996). As such, participation in educational programs is widely believed to help mitigate the psychosocial impacts of a crisis (Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003). Enrollment in educational services is assumed to provide children the opportunity to rebuild social structures and networks in a safe and protected environment. Interactions with peers, teachers, and other community members can further children's development which may be stunted during conflict (Duncan & Arnston, 2004). It can also provide a space for children and youth to share their experiences and get the needed emotional support. Yet, these assertions of protection, which come from scholarly literature, grey literature, and policy documents, are primarily normative prescriptions and do little to explore the experiences of refugee education. As such, my dissertation seeks to illuminate the experiences of Syrian refugee youth, in the particular context of inclusive refugee education.

There is a small body of literature that approaches refugee education with different questions. Rather than taking a normative approach to describing what refugee education *should* do, some scholars take a critical approach and ask questions about what

refugee education *does* and how it acts to support, perpetuate, and challenge social, cultural, economic, and political dynamics in society. While some scholars have addressed these issues in contexts of refugee resettlement, like in the US and Australia (Bajaj, Canlas, & Argenal, 2017; Bartlett, Mendenhall, & Ghaffar-Kucher, 2017; Sidhu & Taylor, 2012), there are still limited critical studies of refugee education in contexts of asylum. Many of those studies center on refugee education in camp-based settings (Fincham, 2012; Oh & Stouwe, 2008; Pherali & Turner, 2018). This research contributes to our understanding of refugee education in urban areas in countries of asylum. Given that over half of today's refugee population live in urban areas, this is an essential context to understand (UNHCR 2017a).

This study also contributes to our understanding of inclusive refugee education. As a relatively new model of refugee education, little is known about how this paradigm of education gets taken up in practice or what "inclusion" in this context actually entails. In their discussion of inclusive refugee education, Dryden-Peterson et al. (2018) define inclusion as a broad "process of coming together" (p. 10) which they understand as a "sociocultural process" that "includes both an individual-level sense of belonging, or connectedness, as well as group-level social cohesion" (p. 10). I build on the current research around inclusive refugee education (Bellino & Dryden-Peterson, 2018; Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018) in three key ways. First, as an ethnographic study, this work provides in-depth attention to the micro-processes of inclusion and the ways in which students and teachers construct and navigate inclusion in the schools. Second, by working in the non-formal education system, my work illuminates new possibilities for inclusive refugee education that is not constrained by the formal education system. Third, this

research provides insight into the education of refugees in the particular regional context of the Middle East, which is unique for both its large number of refugees (UNHCR, 2017a) as well as the legacy of Palestinian refugees in the region which largely shapes how refugees are understood and received in the region (Allaf & Washington, 2013).

Theoretical Framing: Critical Theory and Cultural Production in Education Research

This study draws on the broad body of literature known as critical theory, taking specific insights from the critical notion of cultural production. It is through this lens—one that attends to the role of power and its unequal distribution in society—that I came to analyze and understand inclusive refugee education. Critical theorists assume that certain groups in society are privileged over others, and those privileged groups have an interest in maintaining their dominance through the oppression of others (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011). Although initially rooted in Marxist notions of class domination, critical theory has expanded over time to consider other dynamics of power including gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and citizenship status. Levinson (2011) explains that critical theories are "those conceptual accounts of the social world that attempt to understand and explain the causes of structural domination and inequality in order to facilitate human emancipation and equity" (p. 2). In this definition, Levinson illuminates two important aspects of critical theory. First, he gives attention to structures in society as a way of conceptualizing inequality. Second, he points to the goal of critical social research as contributing to emancipation and equity. That is, critical inquiry is an

attempt to identify *and* address injustice in society (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011).

Critical theory in education stems from the position that education is a political act. Critical scholars of education situate schooling within "unequal relations of power in the larger society and in the realities of dominance and subordination" (Apple, 2010, p. 152). That is, schools are not seen as neutral, independent institutions; rather, schools and their processes, procedures, and pedagogies are examined and analyzed as part of the broader fabric of society and the inequalities within it. Critical scholars of education pay particular attention to the relationships between school and society and ask questions about "what schools do and who benefits" from typical school processes and procedures (Meshulam & Apple, 2010, p. 113). Critical theory helps to illuminate the ways that education distributes power and knowledge in uneven ways throughout society, allowing a focus on both the local level negotiations between students and teachers and the global level of structure and policy that shapes educational provisions (Levinson et al., 2011). In this way, critical theory seeks to understand how marginalization of certain social groups is constructed through schooling as well as the ways that educational actors utilize power to negotiate, contest, and subvert that marginalization.

The concept of cultural production in education illuminates ways that human agency functions in the face of systemic and structural constraints (Levinson, Foley, & Holland, 1996). Through this concept, the processes and practices that take place in school serve to produce and reimagine cultural forms. Scholars of cultural production attend to the micro-level processes of schooling and pay attention to the ways that students, teachers, and other education actors produce culture. They position schooling as

a site of struggle where individual agents shape and make meaning of their experiences. Through this approach, scholars attend to the agency of the individual in the face of broad social and structural constraints. The ethnographic work of Willis (1981) is often described as a pivotal moment in the development of cultural production theory. Through Willis' study of boys is a working-class British school, he showed how they actively resisted the dominant cultural norms and behaviors expected of them; through their subversion, Willis argued that students are not passive and malleable subjects but, rather, active agents in the process of their schooling experience (Levinson et al., 1996).

The theory of cultural production emerged in response to the more deterministic theory of social and cultural reproduction. Scholars of cultural reproduction assert that education is used as a mechanism to transmit dominant social ideologies in order to perpetuate domination and oppression (Apple, 2013; Bernstein, 1981; Bourdieu & Passeron, 2000). These scholars played an important role in showing that schools were not "innocent sites of cultural transmission" where students succeed through a meritocratic system, but rather, schools "exacerbate or perpetuate social inequalities" (Levinson et al., 1996, p. 5). Using the theory of cultural production, scholars argue that the state plays a role in reproducing social and cultural hierarchies through educational policies and the educational structures, practices, pedagogies, and curricula that are used. Illustrating the influence of Marxist ideology on cultural reproduction theorists, Apple (1978) argued that the social, cultural, and political ideologies perpetuated in schools have developed through and are based on the division of labor in society. According to these scholars, schools impose these dominant ideologies and students accept them: in

this way, they are inculcated with ideas, norms, values, language, and behaviors that reinforce social inequalities (Apple, 1978, 2013).

While power in schools plays both a repressive and productive role (Popkewitz, 1999) that aims to reproduce structures in society that benefit the privileged, cultural production accounts for the agency of individuals and collectives to resist. Giroux (2006) describes schools as "contested terrain" (p. xvii) where competing and unequal groups in society struggle to legitimate their view of social order. He understands schools as sites where structural and ideological struggles occur in the face of individual and collective resistance. These struggles illuminate important ways that education actors navigate and negotiate the production of culture and, through this resistance, new cultural forms are produced. Giroux (2006) reminds us that although these struggles occur "within asymmetrical relations of power which always favor the dominant classes" (p. 5), the important point is that these efforts to resist, reject, and refashion the central messages of school and society occur.

Cultural production theory also makes an important contribution by moving away from the sociological understanding of structures associated with reproduction to anthropological notions of culture as an ongoing process of meaning making (Anderson-Levitt, 2012). From this perspective, as Anderson-Levitt explains, culture is not a succinct and fixed unit that *does something*, nor is it a unified set of beliefs or attitudes across groups. Rather, culture is about "the making of meaning, often with an emphasis on the process and with attention to the contest over meaning between more and less powerful actors" (Anderson-Levitt, 2012, p. 441). Through this approach to culture, scholars pay attention to how power relations are both reproduced and also resisted.

Thus, the framework of cultural production "allows us to portray and interpret the way people actively confront the ideological and material conditions presented by schooling" (Levinson et al., 1996, p. 14).

Research Design and Questions

This critical ethnography is based on a year of field research in Jordan. Through my research, I sought to understand the practices, processes, and pedagogies of inclusive refugee education in the NFE program run by FT in collaboration with the Ministry of Education (MoE). I examined the ways that Syrian and Jordanian students and teachers produced a culture of inclusion/exclusion in the space of FT centers. I paid attention to the practices and processes carried out by multiple educational actors, with particular attention given to Jordanian students, Jordanian teachers, and Syrian refugee youth themselves. I considered how interactions between Syrian refugee students and their Jordanian peers and teachers are shaped by and reflect broader social, cultural, political and economic forces in society. I also examined the ways that Syrian refugee youth themselves constructed and navigated FT as both a space of inclusion and exclusion.

I drew on participant observations in three urban NFE centers and FT headquarters (HQ), where I observed and taught. I conducted interviews with FT students, teachers, and administrators, as well as other refugee education providers. Additionally, I spent time with Syrian refugee youth and Jordanian youth in and out of the FT centers. I elaborate on these methods in Chapter Three.

In particular, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What does inclusive refugee education in NFE look like in practice?

2. How do contextual and educational structures and systems shape the practices, processes, and pedagogies of inclusive refugee education in NFE?
3. How do Syrian refugee students, Jordanian students and Jordanian teachers in NFE construct, navigate, and negotiate the practices, processes, and pedagogies of inclusive refugee education to produce a culture of 'inclusion'?

Syrian Refugees in Jordan

A historical overview of refugees in Jordan sheds light on the social and political position of Syrian refugees in Jordan today. This section begins with a brief overview of Jordan's history hosting refugees. This context offers necessary background information to understand the current climate in which Syrian refugees in Jordan live. I then introduce the specific conditions of Syrian refugees, beginning with a discussion of the conflict in Syria, followed by an overview of their origins in Syria and where they settle in Jordan, and, finally, a brief discussion of the living conditions of Syrian refugees in Jordan. This contextualization serves as important grounding for the understanding education of refugees.

A Brief History of Refugees in Jordan

The country of Transjordan (renamed Jordan in 1951) was created as a British mandate in 1921, following the fall of the Ottoman empire at the end of World War I. Britain appointed Abdullah I bin al-Hussein of the Hashemite family as Emir of the new territory and, in collaboration with the British, he established government structures including laws, a police force and a military (Massad, 2001). Transjordan gained independence from Britain in 1946 and, thus, began a process of nation building. As

Adely (2012a) writes, "[T]he story of the making of Jordan, then, is a story of a British-imposed state and Hashemite efforts to create a nation and a national narrative that had the Hashemites at their center" (p. 30). That is, from the establishment of the Transjordan mandate to its independence and beyond, the ruling regime made a conscious effort to bring together the disparate peoples, tribes, and Bedouin population living in this shared territory under a unified nation-state. The process of nation-building entailed the creation of a shared history, culture and values that also served to legitimize the Hashemites as the ruler of this new country. To this end, education was a primary mechanism of construction of national narratives and, indeed, "the cornerstone of the Hashemite nationalization process" (Anderson, 2005 as cited by Shirazi, 2009, p. 32). As will unfold in throughout this study, the ongoing process on the part of the Hashemite regime to legitimize its leadership and cultivate a unified sense of Jordanian-ness comes into tension with educational processes and practices of inclusive refugee education.

Shirazi (2009) notes that "if Jordan is a nation, it is [largely] one historically comprised of itinerants and those displaced by conflict" (p. 26). That is, despite its lack of formal policies towards refugees, Jordan has hosted refugees for over 60 years. The first wave of refugees that arrived in Jordan were Palestinians seeking refuge in 1948 following war with Israel, only two years after Jordan's independence. In 1950, Jordan annexed the territory known today as the West Bank, bringing another 360,000 Palestinians under its rule. In the first four years of its existence, the population of Jordan rose by almost 300% (Massad, 2001). In 1967, another wave of Palestinian refugees flowed into Jordan as a result of the Six-Day War in Israel. As Palestinians were

absorbed into Jordan at different points in time, they were granted various legal statuses in the country.

While the treatment of Palestinians in Jordan varied, it grew increasingly tense in the 1960s as the Palestinians asserted a Palestinian political identity and made certain demands of the government (Robins, 2004). During the time, Jordan also saw the rise of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and Palestinian guerilla groups (referred to as the *Fedayeen).* Tensions between Palestinians and the Jordanian government culminated in the 1970 Black September civil war between the Jordanian military and the PLO, resulting in thousands of Palestinian and Jordanian deaths. The large number of Palestinians in Jordan today, making up at least half of the population (United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], 2010), has continued to pose a challenge to the construction of a Hashemite-centered narrative and shared identity. This challenge has been compounded by the influx of additional refugees over the past thirty years.

Today, refugees in Jordan come from 57 different countries, including Iraq, Syria, and Yemen (UNHCR, 2019). Recent waves of non-Palestinian refugees began en mass with Iraqis. In 1990, Jordan received an influx of Iraqi refugees fleeing from the first Gulf War between Iraq and Kuwait along with several thousand returnees, Jordanians who had been living and working in the Gulf, many of whom had never lived in Jordan before. Another wave of Iraqi refugees entered Jordan following the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 (Mason, 2011; Zaotti, 2006). The population of Iraqi refugees in Jordan increased dramatically in 2006, due to the outbreak of sectarian violence in the country. Since 2011, over 600,000 Syrian refugees have arrived in Jordan. A new wave of Iraqi refugees began entering Jordan in 2014, and today UNHCR (2019) reports over 60,000 Iraqis have

registered with UNHCR. In addition, there are over 14,000 refugees from Yemen, 6,000 from Sudan and a range of other refugees and asylum seekers in the country.

The ongoing influx of refugees in Jordan has led to tensions between populations within the country and reluctance to admit additional refugee populations (Lenner & Schmelter, 2016). Allaf and Washington (2013) note that the large number of Palestinians in Jordan causes "social and political concern within the country as different groups vie for resources, legitimacy, and influence" (p. 167). This social and political concern is not limited to Palestinians but extends to other refugee populations in the country (Allaf & Washington, 2013). Similarly, Barnes (2009) has argued that Jordan's apprehension towards refugees is largely a product of the unresolved and ongoing Palestinian issue: "This issue has fundamentally colored the asylum policies and practices of [Jordan]…and [its] attitudes towards refugees and UNHCR" (p. 16). In considering the reception of Syrian refugees into Jordan and their experiences in inclusive refugee education, it is important to keep this historical context in mind.

Syrian Refugees in Jordan

Conflicts have produced an unprecedented level of forced migration that has not been seen since World War II. The war in Syria is currently the world's largest source of refugees (UNHCR, 2017a), with more than four million Syrians seeking asylum in neighboring countries of Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey. In Jordan, there are currently more than 670,000[2] Syrian refugees, almost half of whom are school-aged children.

[2] The exact number of refugees is unknown. GoJ claims there are 1.5 million Syrians in Jordan (MOPIC, 2015). UNHCR reports 636,040 registered Syrian refugees as of March 16, 2016. This does not include unregistered refugees, whose numbers are not known, or the refugees who have been registered in Jordan but have left.

Seventeen percent of Syrians in Jordan live in three refugee camps, and the remaining 83 percent are considered urban[3] refugees, meaning they have settled in towns and cities throughout the country (UNHCR, 2019). While the Jordanian government has allowed Syrian into the country and designated them as *prima facie*[4] refugees, they have limited rights and no pathway for citizenship. Until 2016, Syrian refugees were not allowed to work legally in the country, leading many refugees to deplete their savings and fall into poverty, vulnerability, and marginality. While possibilities for work have increased, the living conditions of Syrian refugees in Jordan remain dire. Although most refugee situations today are protracted, lasting an average of twenty years, with each refugee remaining in countries of asylum for an average of seventeen years, only one percent of refugees around the world are ever resettled to a third country (UNHCR, 2015). Syrian refugees find themselves in an intractable state of limbo where voluntary repatriation to Syria may not be possible, but the possibility for long-term integration and the likelihood of resettlement to a third country is extremely low.

Almost half the Syrian refugees in Jordan are school-aged (UNHCR, 2019). Given the protracted nature of this conflict, attending school in Jordan represents "their main shot at education" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011a, p. 9). As such, the GoJ opened their schools to Syrian refugee children and youth who have not missed more than three years

[3] The term 'urban refugee' is used in contrast to camp-based refugees. It does not mean that the refugees are necessarily in urban areas. An urban refugee could be in a rural area in Jordan so long as s/he is not in a refugee camp.

[4] *Prima facie* status is a mechanism for responding to large influxes of refugees that allows UNHCR to recognize large groups of people as refugees without going through individual status determination for each one (Rutinwa, 2002).

of school[5]. In doing so, the GoJ "integrates refugee and resilience responses into one single plan for each sector and places the resilience of national systems and institutions at the core of the response" (Ministry of Planning and Cooperation [MOPIC], 2015, p. 9). In other words, humanitarian efforts to support refugee education must, at the very least, address education for Jordanians and, ideally, funding should contribute directly to the Jordanian education system and local programs. In this model, Syrian refugees are integrated into the Jordanian system. Thus, Syrian refugees attend Jordanian schools alongside country nationals, studying the national Jordanian curriculum from national Jordanian teachers. While many Syrian refugees attend school alongside Jordanian peers, a growing number of Syrians attend school in a second shift, where they are primarily with other Syrians, although studying the Jordanian curriculum from Jordanian teachers. This integrated approach to refugee education is supported by the current education strategy of the UNHCR (UNHCR, 2011). Yet, as mentioned earlier, in this inclusive educational context, many refugee children report harassment, bullying, and violence from national teachers and other students. They also indicate challenges with the different curriculum and language. In some cases, these tensions have led refugees to drop out of school (CARE Jordan, 2015; Education Working Group, 2015; MOPIC, 2015).

In this dissertation, I focus on the 83 percent of the Syrian refugee population in Jordan who live outside of refugee camps (UNHCR, 2019). These urban refugees remain an understudied and underserved population, yet there is growing recognition of the

[5] Many Syrian refugees have missed several years of school due to the conflict in Syria. Many of them, then, are ineligible to enroll in formal public schooling in Jordan. These students are able to enroll in non-formal education programs.

unique conditions that they face, particularly in accessing education (Dryden-Peterson, 2011a). By virtue of their physical integration into local communities, it is often more difficult for aid agencies to locate urban refugees and provide them assistance. Without the concentrated networks of refugees and aid agencies that exist in camps, urban refugees are often unaware of their rights or do not have the resources to access them. Financial burdens are often exacerbated in urban areas, leading to dire living conditions. In the case of Jordan, studying urban refugees is particularly important, given the country's long history of urban refugee settlement and the large numbers of urban refugees in the country. Despite the existence of several refugee camps in Jordan, both for Palestinians and now for Syrians, the majority of the country's refugees have always settled in urban areas (Ahmadzadeh et al., 2014).

Who Counts as a Syrian Refugee in Jordan?

In its origins, refugee is a legal term defined as an individual outside of his/her country of nationality due to a fear of persecution based on race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion (United Nations, 1951). It is based on this definition, laid out in the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, that UNHCR grants refugee status. Holders of official refugee status are, therefore, guaranteed the rights laid out in the Convention and eligible for specific services and supports. Jordan has not signed the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees and, as such, is not legally required to provide rights and services to refugees. In 1998, however, the GoJ signed a memorandum of agreement with UNHCR that authorized the agency to administer the refugee status determination process, suggesting tacit support for upholding certain responsibilities towards refugees (Zaiotti, 2006). This MoU was

updated in 2014 to address the Syrian refugee situation, yet details of the MoU remain private (Stevens, 2017). Unlike other refugee populations, Syrians have been designated as prima facie refugees, meaning that they do not need to undergo a rigid status determination process; they are granted status as refugees upon registration with UNHCR (Lenner & Schmelter, 2016).

Since 2015, Syrian refugees have been required to register with UNHCR and GoJ; those who had already registered with UNHCR but not the GoJ had to re-register. Through this process, the GoJ collected a wide range of data about the refugee and provided a magnetic identification card with a biometrical iris scan tied to the location of registration (Lenner, 2016). Syrians could only receive aid in the geographical communities in which they were registered, thereby restricting their mobility within the country. The process also included high fees, which were lowered in 2016, but prevented some Syrians from registering, which restricted their access to services and pushed them into a further vulnerable position. Syrian refugees who had initially registered in camps and left through informal channels may also not formally register with the GoJ. The multifarious processes and policies involved in refugee status determination point to the contingent nature of refugee status and refugeeness in Jordan. Given the multiple challenges Syrians face in registering with UNHCR, and the ongoing changes and confusion around the process, I consider a refugee to be any Syrian in Jordan who left their home after the start of the conflict in Syria in 2011, whether they have legal refugee status or not.

Throughout this dissertation, however, I do not use the term refugee frequently. This is because it was not a term used by either Syrians or Jordanians during my research.

Refugees, whether from Syria or other countries, were frequently referred to by national origin only, without the attachment of the refugee label. This aligns with the GoJ discourse around Syrians in the country and allows the government to report a much larger number of Syrians in the country than simply the number registered with UNHCR. The GoJ claims there are 1.3 million Syrians in the country, by including 650,000 refugees registered with UNHCR and an additional 750,000 refugees who were said to be in Jordan prior to the outbreak of the conflict. There is general agreement among non-governmental actors that this number is exaggerated, but it bolsters the claims of the GoJ and Jordanians of the Syrian burden on the country (Lenner, 2016). Referring to individuals by their nationality and not adding the refugee label serves a second, more inclusive, purpose. As several scholars have argued, the refugee label imposes a range of ideas and identities upon individuals related to vulnerability, victimhood, and invisibility (Black, 2001; Zetter, 1991). Avoiding this label actually serves to humanize Syrian refugees and construct a notion of sameness between Syrians and Jordanians, which, at times, helps to construct a sense of inclusion. I discuss this further in Chapters Four and Five.

Living Conditions of Urban Syrian Refugees in Jordan

Life for Syrian refugees in urban areas remains precarious, with overcrowded housing, tenuous rental agreements, high levels of poverty, and limited employment opportunities and limited access to health care despite high needs (JIF, 2018). According to Jalbout (2015), the World Bank reports that 14.4 percent of Jordanian citizens were living below the poverty line in 2010, before Syrian refugees entered the country. The country has consistently faced poverty, high unemployment and low quality education

(Jalbout, 2015). The influx of Syrian refugees has only weakened the country's infrastructure and its ability to provide quality services to its disadvantaged population. According to a study carried out in partnership with OFI, UNICEF and UNHCR, the majority of the Syrian refugee population in urban areas in Jordan live below the national poverty line (Abu Hamad et al., 2017), and according to a report published by the World Bank and UNHCR, 69 percent of Syrian refugees are considered poor[6] (Verme, Chiara, Wieser, Hedlund, Petzoldt, & Santacroce, 2016). Further, since the start of the Syrian refugee situation in Jordan, wages have fallen, prices of basic commodities have risen around 15 percent, and housing costs have increased, nearly tripling in border towns. This economic situation has made life financially more difficult for the low-income population of Jordan as well as the Syrian refugees. It has also contributed to the growing sense of resentment towards Syrian refugees among much of the Jordanian population. To add to these tensions, international humanitarian aid for refugees in Jordan has decreased as the crisis has continued, leading to even fewer resources (Education Sector Working Group, 2015; Jalbout, 2015).

In a study conducted by Abu Hamad et al. (2017) they found that over one-third of households of Syrian refugees in Jordan had at least one member with a chronic illness and 19 percent of families reported having a child who had been sick in the past two weeks. Jordanian INGO Forum [JIF] (2018) also noted high levels of psychosocial distress among children and adults. Bullying, discrimination and harassment in and

[6] Using the UNHCR poverty line of 50 Jordanian dinar per person per month (approx. US $5.25 per capita per day)

around school was a high cause of stress for Syrian children. Despite high medical needs, Syrian refugees in urban areas do not receive health insurance. This triggers higher health care fees which are raised even higher due to a "foreigner's fee" that raise the price anywhere from 35-60 percent (JIF, 2018). Studies have found that in addition to the high costs of medical visits, transportation to doctors as well as the cost of medication are restrictive and prevent some people from seeking medical treatment, even low-cost treatment offered by NGOs or other providers (Abu Hamad et al., 2018; JIF, 2018).

Despite the Jordan Compact of 2016, through which the GoJ committed to creating 200,000 jobs for Syrian refugees in particular sectors, few Syrian refugees have found work legally. Many are unaware of the changed restrictions or understand the process of obtaining a work permit (Abu Hamad et al., 2017; Barbelet, Hagen-Zanker, & Mansour-Ille, 2018). According to a report by the International Labor Organization (ILO) (2015), "the ability for Syrian refugees to obtain work permits remains, at best, a convoluted process" (p. 15). Only 20 percent of respondents in the survey carried out by Abu Hamad et al. reported having even applied for a work permit and only 18 percent reported having legal employment at the time. A survey conducted by CARE (2017) found that 77 percent of respondents were unemployed. Syrians are allowed to receive work permits in agriculture and construction, but to work in other permitted sectors, they need sponsorship from a Jordanian. Despite having opened work opportunities in particular sectors, refugees are excluded from working in high skilled or semi-skilled sectors (JIF, 2018), leaving many to work informally or remain unemployed.

Due to high unemployment rates, many Syrian refugees report high levels of debt. Syrian refugees have primarily exhausted their savings, sold their primary assets, and rely

on borrowing (JIF, 2018). CARE (2017) found that Syrian families' household expenditures were 25 percent more than their income. As a result, 88.9 percent of Syrian families reported being in debt.

Because of the difficulty refugee adults have in obtaining work and the high levels of poverty among Syrian refugees, many refugee households rely on their children to bring in income. Abu Hamad et al. (2017) found that few individuals formally reported child labor in quantitative surveys, but their qualitative research showed that "most adolescent boys appear to work – sometimes for long hours in exploitative conditions and almost always for very low pay" (p. 19). This is supported by other qualitative research and my own experiences in Jordan. According to a 2015 study by UNICEF (as cited in Jalbout, 2015), children contribute to the family income in almost half of all Syrian refugee households outside of camps. UNHCR (2013) reports that 47 percent of households rely party or entirely on children for their household income and that one in ten refugee children work to some degree, by conducting menial labor on farms, working in service industries such as restaurants, retail or in more skilled sectors such as carpentry, motor shops or barbershops. The burden is worse for boys and for youth ages 15-24, who have been forced to quit school and work to support their family and younger siblings.

Education for Syrian Refugees in Jordan

Jordan has supported the provision of refugee education since the influx of Palestinian refugees in 1948. To accommodate the education of Palestinians, the GoJ supported the development of a parallel education system for Palestinians. Today, this

system exists in the 174 schools for Palestinian refugees which are located in 13 refugee camps around the country and supported by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees (UNRWA), the UN agency mandated to support Palestinian refugees (UNICEF, 2010). Given the broad integration of Palestinians into Jordanian society, around 50 percent of Palestinian children in Jordan attend Jordanian government schools (UNICEF, 2010).

Since 2003, the Jordanian MoE has collaborated with international partners and donors to engage in an extensive development project aimed at overhauling the education sector. The program, known as Education Reform for Knowledge Economy (ERfKE), builds on human capital theory by improving education in order to increase opportunity for employment (Shirazi, 2010). Its main goal is to reform the public education sector so it equips students with knowledge and skills to compete in "an increasingly unpredictable labor market" (Kubow, 2010, p. 10). The program has included changes to the national curriculum to include critical and creative thinking skills, system strengthening through improved monitoring and evaluation, and pedagogical reform towards increased active learning techniques (Kubow, 2010; Kubow & Kreishan, 2014; Roggeman & Shukri, 2010). As Syrian refugees entered into the country, the GoJ made efforts to accommodate them in the educational system while protecting the advances it had made in educational development (MOPIC, 2016).

The GoJ, with support from the international community, took great strides to support education Syrian refugees by incorporating them into the formal and non-formal education system, expanding school infrastructure, and hiring new teachers. These efforts were bolstered under the Jordan Compact, signed in February 2016, which included a

"landmark commitment to ensure that every child in Jordan will be in education in the 2016/2017 school year" (Jordan Compact, 2016, p. 2). Under the Jordan Compact, the GoJ made several commitments to refugee education. First, the GoJ had already opened 98 afternoon school shifts for Syrians in the public schools; under the Jordan Compact, the GoJ committed to temporarily opening another 102, for a total of 200 double shift schools. Second, the GoJ committed to improving educational quality in the afternoon shifts by providing additional training to teachers and ensuring that school infrastructure like computer labs and libraries are available in the second shift. Third, the GoJ committed to working with education partners to expand learning support services for Syrian refugees and vulnerable Jordanians.

My research took place in the 2016-2017 academic year as efforts towards the Jordan Compact commitment were being rolled out. At that time, there were three primary educational options for Syrian refugees. First, they could enroll in the public school in either the first or second shift. At the time of my research, the majority of Syrian students studied in the first shift alongside Jordanian students (Human Rights Watch, 2016). Second, Syrian students could attend the NFE program, a two year accelerated learning program that culminated in a tenth grade certificate from the Ministry of Education. Third, Syrian students could participate in Learning Support Services (LSS), which included remedial education and catch-up programs. Remedial education provided additional academic support to students already enrolled in school to make sure they stayed in school. The catch-up program offered education to students who are not in school to help prepare them to enroll in school.

All educational programs for Syrian refugees also included Jordanian students. The so-called 30-70 policy put forth by the Ministry of Education required that 30 percent of beneficiaries of any educational program for Syrian refugees be Jordanian. This ensured the continuing development of the Jordanian education system, avoided the creation of a parallel education system, and sought to cultivate social cohesion between Jordanians and Syrians.

As a result of the efforts made by the GoJ and the international community to support refugee education, school enrollment for Syrian refugees increased from 145,458 students in the 2015-16 school year to 167,820 students in the 2016-2017 school year (UNICEF Jordan, 2017). The increased access was, in part, attributed to the expansion of the second shift program; yet, in 2018, Assaad (2018) found that 56 percent of Syrian students in Jordan studied in second shifts, meaning that still a large number of Syrian students studied alongside Jordanians. In the 2016-2017 school year, an additional 1300 students began the NFE program and by 2018, there were over 6600 Syrian refugees enrolled in the program.

Despite the GoJ's efforts to support education of Syrian refugees, Syrian refugee students face many educational challenges in Jordan, which can be broken into three main categories: financial barriers; distances to school; and school capacity, quality and environment (AARD, 2016; Ahmadazeh et al., 2014; CARE Jordan, 2014; CARE Jordan, 2015; Education Sector Working Group, 2015; Human Rights Watch, 2016). A survey of 1,300 urban refugee families conducted by CARE Jordan (2015) found that 39 percent of responded listed financial resources as the primary barrier to education. While public school is technically free, a UNICEF report noted that the average monthly auxiliary cost

of school attendance for Syrian refugees is approximately 27 Jordanian Dinars ($38.00 US dollars) (as cited by Education Sector Working Group, 2015). This includes paying for tuition, books, and clothing. Given the poverty experienced by many Syrian refugees, it is often difficult to pay the expenses of schooling on top of other basic needs. Additionally, almost half of all urban Syrian refugee families rely on their children, especially boys, to bring in at least a part of the family income (Education Sector Working Group, 2015), precluding them from attending school.

For many urban refugees, they must travel long distances to attend school. In addition to the costs of transportation, many parents express concerns over the safety of such transportation, especially for girls (Education Sector Working Group, 2015). Safety and security is an issue for students in school, too. Many students experience discrimination, physical harassment, corporal punishment and bullying from students and teachers in schools. Beyond the hostile environment, Syrian children struggle with the new curriculum in Jordanian schools and, due to severe overcrowding in schools, do not get the support they need from teachers. Teachers are often overworked, often teaching two shifts a day, and lack the training necessary to support large classrooms and the unique needs of refugee students (Ahmadazeh, et al., 2014; Education Sector Working Group, 2015).

The needs assessment conducted by the Education Sector Working Group (ESWG) (2015) also investigated students' attitude towards NFE as offered by FT. The ESWG is a coordination mechanism that fosters collaboration and coordination among institutions working within Jordan to support access to quality education for Syrian refugees. It found that students spoke positively about FT centers and highlighted how

well they are treated by teachers. They enjoy the opportunity to be with peers and spend time with their friends and the ability engage in activities such as sports, too. However, students did note that safety is a concern in attending NFE. While inside the classrooms students are treated well and feel safe, they often experience harassment and violence outside the centers. Students mentioned encountering gangs and bullies who expose guns, drugs, and knives while children are on their way to the NFE centers.

Forseh Tanieh: Site of Study

This study took place in the organization of FT, an international non-governmental organization founded and registered in Jordan. FT is the primary provider of NFE in Jordan, offered to any person (Jordanian or otherwise) living in Jordan between the ages of 13-20. FT works in close collaboration with the Jordanian MoE to provide certified and relevant education to vulnerable children who have left formal schooling. This is necessary in Jordan because, by law, students who have been out of school for more than three years are ineligible to reenter the school system. Thus, FT has been providing Jordanian students opportunities to continue their education for over twenty years. Since 2006, when Jordan faced an influx of Iraqi refugees, FT has been a major player in refuge education in Jordan.

The NFE program is comprised of three eight-month cycles that result in a tenth grade certificate from the MoE. With this certificate, students can continue with further vocational and technical training or enroll in public school and complete a high school education, with the possibility to then continue on to university. As of 2017, FT was running 121 NFE classes, 115 in host communities and 6 in refugee camps, with plans to

open an additional 60 centers in host communities and 16 in refugee camps. There were 6,637 students enrolled in the centers and 40 percent of them were Syrian (personal communication, March 13, 2018).

FT education takes place in GoJ schools provided by the MoE and is taught exclusively by certified MoE teachers who, by law, must also be teaching in Jordanian public schools. FT teachers receive additional training from FT in critical pedagogy and empowerment. The educational approach focuses on critical pedagogy through participatory learning methods in order to cultivate critical thinking and lead to individual transformation. I elaborate on FT's mission in Chapter Four.

I selected to work with FT for three primary reasons. First, as I illustrated in the opening vignette, students of FT consider the educational program a supportive space that fosters a positive learning environment. FT has a long history of supporting refugees in Jordan through an inclusive model and has been upheld in the international community as an organization working successfully with refugees. Conducting my research in such a location allows me to look closer at what is working and investigate more deeply how practices and processes work and what they produce. Conducting my research with FT allows me to follow on Heath and Heath's notion of bright spot research, focusing on "successful efforts worth emulating" (2010, p. 29). Second, FT's program of NFE allows administrators, teachers, and students flexibility in terms of pedagogical approaches and educational outcomes, which enables them to focus on social and emotional components of learning and cultivating a sense of inclusion between Syrians and Jordanians. This offered me an opportunity to see how education could be done differently, outside of the rigid structure of formal education. Finally, I selected to work with FT as the MoE put

up significant barriers to researchers interested in working within the formal education system. Conversely, the Director of FT invited me into the organization and has provided ongoing support for and interest in my research. It should be noted that while this research takes place in the NFE sector, I believe it holds lessons that can be broadly applied to a range of contexts offering inclusive refugee education. Despite the unique characteristics of FT's NFE program, the findings from this study illuminate challenges faced across educational situations and ways that educational actors may begin to address them.

Significance

Through this study, I aim to illuminate the stories of Syrian refugee youth in inclusive refugee education and, by doing so, highlight the practices, processes, and pedagogies of this model of refugee education. I seek to engage with and contribute to several conversations relating to refugees and education across a variety of fields. First, this work contributes to a growing body of literature that employs critical theory to examine refugee education. As I will elaborate upon in Chapter Two, much of the literature around refugee education highlights refugee education as a fundamental human right for all children. It examines the role refugee education can and should play in providing safe and protective environments and providing refugees with knowledge and skills that will enable them to contribute to rebuilding their countries after war. By using an alternative theoretical lens, this study helps to move the field beyond normative evaluations of refugee education into analytical investigations of the seen and unseen consequences of refugee education, particularly as they relate to notions of inclusion and

exclusion. In this particular moment when global politics have led to increasingly exclusionary national ideologies and education tends to play a role in perpetuating hegemonic norms, understanding the processes that shape a young person's inclusion in school and society (or lack thereof) and the interplay between the two is paramount.

Second, this study makes conceptual contributions to the understanding of inclusion in the context of refugee education. The literature around inclusive education tends to focus on the ideals of what inclusive education should look like and the pedagogies and educational materials necessary to achieve those goals. Moreover, studies of inclusive education typically center narrowly on children with disabilities (though not exclusively). This study expands the concept of inclusion as an ongoing process centered around social, emotional, and relational dimensions of schooling for students with a broad range of differences.

Third, the practices and impacts of inclusive refugee education as implemented in FT centers reflect the broader policy context towards refugees in Jordan and globally. Illuminating how these policies work governance and ways that they are taken up by different actors provides new insight to refugee education policy. As such, this study responds to Jacobsen and Landau's (2003) call for a "dual imperative in refugee research" (p. 186). By this they mean that research is academically sound but also policy-relevant. Understanding how education policies shape the educational experiences of refugee youth illuminates ways that education policy contributes to future aspirations and a sense of comfort and belonging in society. This holds important social and political implications for students' futures in the host country and beyond. Working within FT and learning how the organization interprets policies of integrated refugee education and puts

them into action as well as the policies influences on refugee youth enables me to make recommendations for their improvement.

As I demonstrated earlier in the chapter, UNHCR has changed its global refugee education strategy, placing emphasis on integration of refugees into national education systems (Dryden-Peterson, 2011a; UNHCR, 2011). As countries hosting urban refugee populations continue to implement this strategy of inclusive refugee education, new questions are raised about how this policy functions in practice and what its effects are on refugee youth. The Jordanian government has a history of integrating refugees into public schools and, as such, this study can inform potential impacts of this policy approach in other refugee situations. That is, as UNHCR moves towards a strategy of inclusive refugee education across the globe, this research derives lessons that can be applied to the education of the 26 million refugee children and youth around the world.

Finally, this study seeks to contribute to a growing body of critical ethnographies that examine what happens in schools across the Middle East. These scholars, including Herrera (2003, 2006, 2010), Mazawi (1999, 2002, 2010), Adely (2004, 2012), and Shirazi (2009, 2012, 2015) argue that sociopolitical practices as they take place in schools have long been overlooked in education research in the Middle East and Arab world. By focusing on micropractices and individual experiences in schooling, my study uncovers a critical element of *what* schools produce and *how* they produce it (Shirazi, 2009). While educational sites might be highly regulated by the state, including NFE centers, scholars have shown that there is room for social and civic struggle and contestation (Adely, 2012a; Shirazi, 2012). In the context of Jordan, where tensions between refugees and nationals are growing and Syrian refugees are increasingly marginalized, it is important

to examine how refugees engage with dominant social discourses and how they internalize, manipulate, and contest them.

My work contributes to this scholarship in two ways. First, focusing on refugees represents a new approach in this body, a missing population given their significant presence in the region. While some scholars (Shirazi, 2012) do include refugees in their study, and others have studied Palestinian refugees, mine will be one of the few studies that focuses exclusively on a non-Palestinian refugee population in Jordan. Second, these scholars have focused primarily on formal education. My study of NFE will add additional insight to the ways that students encounter and navigate the state and other ways that civic identity and subjectivity is shaped in the region.

Conclusion and Organization of the Dissertation

In this chapter, I have introduced the new paradigm of inclusive refugee education as put forth by the UNHCR Global Education Strategy. Through the stories of Nour, Hiba, and Isra, I pointed to the contradictory experiences of inclusive refugee education in Jordan, where Syrian refugees in formal schools, like Nour and Hiba, experience significant levels of harassment and discrimination while, in contrast, those in the NFE system like Isra report very different, and positive, experiences. This contradiction raises questions about the practices of NFE: How do teachers implement inclusive refugee education in this context? What are the experiences of students—Syrian and Jordanian—in this inclusive environment? And, importantly, how do broader social, political, and economic dimension of society play out in the NFE setting? This dissertation attempts to explore these questions and shed light on the processes of inclusive refugee education for

Syrian refugees in Jordan. In this work, I employed a year-long critical ethnography to study the experiences of students and teachers while also embedding those experiences in the broader environment of society.

In Chapter Two, I build upon this chapter by bringing together disparate bodies of literature to frame this study. The literature review begins with an overview of the scholarly approaches to studying refugee education, situating this work in critical approaches to refugee education. I then turn to an examination of integration and inclusion as the terms are taken up in both refugee studies and education studies. Finally, I overview the ethnographic literature of education in the Middle East.

Chapter Three provides an overview of the study's methodology and research design. I introduce the concept of critical ethnography and review the methods that I used, including interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. I also discuss my approach to analysis and writing through both ethnographic and narrative lenses and conclude with a discussion of ethical challenges and considerations of the study.

Chapter Four introduces three strands of context necessary to understand the study (Sobe & Kowalcyzk, 2012). Drawing on the work of el-Abed (2015), I examine the discursive tensions in Jordan between unconditional hospitality towards refugees and conditional hospitality mediated through the perceived demographic, security, and development threats of refugees. I analyze the policy context focusing on the UNHCR Global Education Strategy, the Regional Resilience and Response Plan, and the Jordan Response Plan. I then introduce in greater detail the organizational context of FT, introducing its structure, mission, and approach to teaching.

Chapters Five through Seven present the main findings of my dissertation. They are organized around the three areas of school life as identified by Apple (2012), namely: (1) the daily practices of schooling; (2) curricular knowledge; (3) pedagogies and practices employed by teachers. Apple asserts that examining these three spheres of schooling helps to illuminate the political, social, economic interests embedded in schooling practices as well as the ways that students and teachers engage with these interests.

In this vein, Chapter Five examines the "day-to-day regularities of schools" (Apple, 2013, p. 29). I draw on a theoretical framework of belonging and the politics of belonging (Antonsich, 2010; Yuval-Davis, 2011) to explore how Syrian and Jordanian students construct and navigate inclusion/integration in FT. I argue that they draw on a notion of sameness to cultivate a sense of belonging, but when that sameness is called into question, belonging is (temporarily) suspended.

In Chapter Six, I analyze two FT textbooks to show how the prescribed curriculum shapes ideas of inclusion and exclusion through the themes of Islam, nationalism, and employment. I argue that although the curriculum is primarily exclusionary, students (and teachers) enact this inclusion and exclusion based on their lived realities as gendered being with different citizenship statuses and opportunities for employment.

In Chapter Seven, I illuminate tensions in FT teaching practices. I argue that teachers employ a caring approach to teaching in efforts to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of all students; yet, teachers are still products of their society, impacted by broader social norms towards refugees.

In Chapter Eight, I conclude the dissertation with implications for scholarship, policy, and practice of refugee education. I also discuss avenues for further research.

Chapter 2: Approaches to Refugee Education

The purpose of this chapter is to situate this study within the larger scholarly discussions and debates that both inform my understanding of refugee education in the Middle East and with which I engage throughout the study. I analyze three different approaches that scholars have taken to understanding and analyzing refugee education.

The first approach relies on an instrumentalist perspective on refugee education, focusing heavily on normative global policies and frameworks to advocate for the provision of refugee education. These studies, which come from both scholarly literature and grey literature,[7] played an essential role in promoting refugee education as a priority within humanitarian aid.

The second approach moves beyond normative prescriptions of what refugee education *should* be, and, instead, illustrates how refugee students and teachers perceive education. While this literature has played an important role in giving voice to refugees, I maintain that it focuses too heavily on the agency of refugees without placing agency in the context of structural and system constraints.

In the final approach, scholars draw on critical theory to analyze refugee education in its broader social and political context, considering the ways that power relations in society shape and structure refugee education. Along with this critical approach to understanding refugee education, I review literature that draws on a critical approach to education in the Middle East, which further contextualizes and situates my

[7] Grey literature refers to materials and research produced by organizations, governments, UN agencies and other non-traditional sources.

study. I argue that while all three approaches have helped to inform this study, it is this third approach, drawing on critical theory, which best informs and supports my study.

Refugee Education and Education in Emergencies: Dominant Discourses in the Field

Actors involved with refugee education uphold such education as a fundamental human right that should be accessible to all young people. Advocates and scholars of refugee education have put forth education as an essential element of the refugee solution that is "life sustaining and life saving" (INEE, 2010, p. 4) and inscribed in a range of treaties and conventions including the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees. Such education, they claim, normalizes the situation for children, returning them to daily routines, provides physical, cognitive and psychosocial protection, and ultimately offers "stability, economic growth, and better lives for children, families and communities" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011a, p.8). Access to quality education can heal a community and reinstate a sense of identity and self for individuals affected by crisis.

In this section, I will outline the three leading discourses that serve to support refugee education. They are: (1) education as a human right; (2) education is physically, cognitively, and emotionally protective; and (3) education contributes to future livelihoods and economic development. While this literature has been important in promoting the practice of refugee education in emergency situations, this literature remains normative and instrumental in how it approaches education. In my discussion of the roots of these three discourses, I will also highlight some of the critiques that challenge these ideas.

Education as a Human Right

The provision of refugee education rests on the premise that all individuals have a universal, inalienable, and indivisible right to education, regardless of who they are or in what context they live (Demirdjian, 2011; Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003; Pigozzi, 1999; Save the Children, 2008). This right was first outlined in the 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR) and echoed in the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (from here on, the Refugee Convention) (United Nations). Article 22 of the Refugee Convention (United Nations, 1951) states that signatories "shall accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education…[and] treatment as favourable as possible… with respect to education other than elementary education." The UNHCR 2012-2016 (2012) GES, too, highlights the rights based element of education: "All refugee children *have the right* to go to primary school and the primary school cycle is where the basic learning competencies that form the foundation of further education are acquired" (p. 10, emphasis added). Pigozzi (1999) adds that education "is also an enabling right, in that it assists children and adults to access their other rights" (p.2). Many refugee hosting countries, however, have not signed the Refugee Convention, including Jordan, and thus are not legally bound to upholding these rights.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) (United Nations, 1989), in contrast to the Refugee Convention, is the most widely ratified international human rights document (Sinclair, 2001) and has been signed by all countries but two (the United States and Somalia). The composition and ratification of the CRC represented a paradigm shift in the development project, spearheaded by the United Nations, from one of a needs-

based approach to a human rights-based approach (Uvin, 2004). In this rights-based approach, education is understood, first and foremost, as a right to which everyone is guaranteed. Furthermore, education serves as a key mechanism for both strengthening the capacity of the rights holders and empowering them to claim their rights. The CRC remains at the core of current refugee education programs. Accordingly, Jordan and other countries that have not signed the Refugee Convention but have signed the CRC are obligated to provide education for refugees.

Jordan, at least in its policies, embraces this right, as is evidenced by the *2016-2018 Jordan Response Plan: Syrian Crisis* (JRP) (MOPIC, 2015). Regarding education, the JRP states the following:

> *The right to education is afforded to all individuals without exception;* even in times of conflict or disaster. Those that have been displaced and those that host them require support to ensure that this right extends beyond access to services, but also guarantees quality and relevance. (p. 50, emphasis added)

Refugee education in Jordan is provided predominantly by the state, but with significant support—especially financial—from bilateral and multilateral donor agencies, the United Nations and NGOs. Many of these agencies and organizations, too, uphold the notion of education as a human right and, as such, have placed pressure on Jordan to ensure education for all children and youth living within its borders (Education Sector Working Group, 2015).

Shortly after the ratification of the Convention of the Rights of the Child in 1989, UN agencies, donors, governments, and international NGOs met at the World Conference on Education for All (EFA) in Jomtien, Thailand. This meeting launched the Education

for All movement, an international coalition based in the notion of education as a fundamental human right. The resulting document, the *World Declaration on Education for All,* asserted that "basic education should be provided to all children, youth and adults" (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 1990, p. 4). EFA was also seen as closely aligned with the Millennium Development Goals, eight international goals set by the UN which served as a blueprint for development by 2015. While education in emergencies was not prevalent in the EFA discussions in 1990, it emerged as a theme in the mid-decade EFA meeting in 1996 and was identified as one of the nine flagship initiatives of the EFA movement at the World Education Forum in 2000 (Dryden-Peterson, 2011a; Kagawa, 2005). Support for education in emergencies under EFA plays a critical role in framing policy and procedures for ensuring refugees education and holding governments and international actors accountable to its provision (K. Johnson, 2013).

Today, global development is driven by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), 17 goals aimed at ending poverty and inequality by 2030. SDG Four, the goal related to education, seeks to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning for all" (United Nations, 2016). Target 4.5 of SDG Four seeks to ensure equal access to education for all vulnerable individuals, including "children in vulnerable situations" (SDG 4). Both the *Incheon Declaration* (UNESCO, 2017) and *Education 2030: Framework for Action* (UNESCO, 2017), the key policy documents associated with SDG 4, specify the need to support education for refugees and the commitment to "meeting the needs of children, youth and adults in crisis contexts, including internally displaced persons and refugees" (UNESCO, 2017, para 26)

As is evident from the rich body of education in emergency advocacy literature, many laud the shift to a rights-based approach to development in its ability to provide policy direction, with values at the center of the conversation. The emphasis on human rights provides a universal framework that holds governments accountable to the provision of education for all learners. However, Uvin (2007), Cornwall and Nyamu-Musembi (2004), and Greany (2008) critique the normative, rights-based approach as a neo-colonial imposition of western ideals. Drawing on the work of Hausermann (1998), Cornwall and Nyamu-Musembi (2004) ague that "what is distinctive about a human rights approach to development is that it works by setting out a vision of what *ought* to be" (p. 1416). Yet, as some scholars argue, the normative assumption of what 'ought to be' is based on Western moral and political theory and neoliberal economic ideals (Nyers, 1999). Thus, "[de]manding rights can therefore be seen as an imposition of Western values and norms on other cultures, and as a foisting of a linear model of progression towards 'modernisation' that destroys in its path valued tradition" (Greany, 2008, p. 557). Basing policy on a human rights model and adapting a universal approach to human rights risks a (neo)colonial imposition of Western values onto other cultures (Corwall & Nyamu-Musembi, 2004) that does not account for the needs and interests of the communities it seeks to protect.

The human rights model asserts that compliance with these (Western) norms will advance societies to a level of proper functioning and assist on their way to development. Following in line with Inkeles (1998), "modernity…does not just happen. It comes about because of the existence of policies of development that are either successful or unsuccessful, or if you like, correct or incorrect" (p. 74). In this case, universal human

rights serve as a set of 'correct' policies that will advance developed countries into modernity and development. Uvin (2007) upholds this idea by arguing that "an enormous amount of this [rights-based] work was little more than thinly disguised presentations of old wine in new bottles" (p. 599). That is, several development actors pay lip service to the rhetoric of human rights while maintaining their imperialist and modernist approaches. Some argue that human rights, in this way, gives the development project legal authority to impose western values.

Education as Protective

The rationale for education in emergencies goes beyond the human rights argument. Education is also upheld for its utility in providing physical, cognitive and emotional protection (Davies & Talbot, 2008; Talbot 2013). First and foremost, it is said that sending children to school during a crisis and in a refugee situation provides physical protection (Burde, 2005). In school, children are in a supervised environment under the care of an adult (Nicolai, 2003). In this way, children are shielded from exploitation from drug trafficking, recruitment into the military or other armed forces, child labor or sexual abuse (Save the Children, 2008).

Terror, violence, and loss cause psychological damage with potential risk of long-term emotional and social effects. As Machel (1996) wrote:

> Not only are large numbers of children killed and injured, but countless others grow up deprived of their material and emotional needs, including the structures that give meaning to social and cultural life. The entire fabric of their societies--their homes, schools, health systems, and religious institutions--are torn to pieces. (p. 15)

Indeed, during an emergency, the very foundation of a child's life breaks down as families are torn apart, communities divided, and trust among people breaks down (Save the Children Alliance, 1996). While children demonstrate great resiliency, they need supportive structures and individuals to reinforce their natural resilience (Loughry & Eyber, 2003; Save the Children Alliance, 1996). As such, participation in educational programs helps to mitigate the psychosocial impacts of a crisis (Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003).

Education in context of crisis and conflict can produce stability for children and normalize their daily experiences. Violence and situations of forced migration destabilize a child's family and social environment, impacting every aspect of a child's life (Pigozzi, 1999, p. 2). As Duncan and Arnston (2004) explain, "traditional community structures are broken down….cultural norms and coping mechanisms are disintegrated, and relationships and networks, which traditionally provide support during crises, are destroyed" (p. 4). Formal or informal schooling and activities can help children return to familiar routines. By participating in some form of structured educational programming, refugee children can feel a sense of normalcy and calm in the midst of chaos. Enrollment in educational services provides children the opportunity to rebuild social structures and networks in a safe and protected environment. The occurrence of a crisis resulting in displacement can also harm cognitive development and "literacy, numeracy and critical thinking [may be] delayed" (Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003, p. 1). Interactions with peers, teachers and other community members further children's development which may be stunted (Duncan & Arnston, 2004). It also provides a space for children and youth to share their experiences and get the needed emotional support. Additionally, educational

programs with an element of psychosocial support can increase a learner's sense of self-worth, help build his/her self-confidence, and continue to develop his/her personal identity.

This discourse of protection, which is prevalent in the academic literature, also appears in refugee education policy, such as the UNHCR Global Education Strategy (2012) and the *2016-2018 Jordan Response Plan: Syrian Crisis* (JRP) (MOPIC, 2015). The Global Education Strategy states that a "fundamental objective of refugee education is to meet the *protection needs of refugee children* and young people" (UNHCR, 2012, p. 14, emphasis added). Furthermore, the strategy argues that "to be protective, schools must be physically safe, psychologically and emotionally healing, socially integrated, and cognitively transformative" (p. 15). This aligns with the dominant ideas of education as protection—that it is physically, emotionally, and cognitively protective. The JRP (MOPIC, 2015) similarly emphasizes the notion of protection. It states that "quality education protects against exploitation and ensures that an individual's potential is not denied due to uncontrollable circumstances" (pp. 50-51). Objective 2 of the education response relates to improved education services to sustain access to "adequate, safe, and protective learning spaces" (p. 51). However, the JRP interestingly shifts the meaning of protection by stating the following: "The focus on quality also recognizes the burden placed on the children and youth that share their communities and classrooms, and protects the education reform efforts underway in Jordan" (p. 51). That is, the JRP looks at protection not only for the refugee population but for the development of Jordan and their education system.

This trope of protection, which still appears in policies supporting education in

emergencies and refugee education (see, for example, the UNHCR Education Strategy, 2012), has come under scrutiny by several scholars. They argue that school buildings, teachers, and students have actually been the target of violence during armed conflict (Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003). Moreover, they show how schools can perpetuate physical violence through bullying, discrimination, or corporal punishment (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Kirk & Winthrop, 2009). Schools have also been shown to perpetuate conflict and hatred symbolically through the formal curriculum as well as through the agency of teachers and students who may perpetuate distrust and cultivate divisions between ethnic, religious, or political groups (Adelman, 2018; Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Davies, 2004, 2010; Dryden-Peterson, 2015a, 2015b).

Education for Development

In this third trope, education in emergencies is established to assist with future economic gain; that is, education will provide knowledge and skills that students will need to obtain jobs in the future, once the conflict is over. Davies and Talbot (2008) articulate this as follows:

> Schooling for these learners provides hope for the future. This means that acquisition of skills is vital—not necessarily vocational skills directly but definitely those that provide both an entry into jobs and entry into the world of those who are making decisions about people's lives. (p. 513)

This notion that education provides hope for the future is reaffirmed by Crisp and Talbot (2001), who write that "[r]estoration of schooling brings the widely recognized benefits of schooling as such, including its contribution to productivity and economic development" (p. 10). Nicolai (2003) emphasizes that "[a] useful education is one that

helps kids become literate and numerate, acquire basic skills for livelihoods, become responsible members of society, extend understanding of the world around them" (p. 12). As Nicolai points out, education provides technical skills that will help with job attainment and soft skills, such as interpersonal communication, critical thinking, and decision-making, that will serve children in other aspects of life. Pigozzi (1999) echoes this idea in writing that education "is essential in assisting children to deal with their future more confidently and effectively, and can be instrumental in making it possible for them to develop a peaceful society" (p. 2). She continues to say that education "is used by society to instill attitudes, values, and certain types of knowledge in its newest citizens, its future leaders" (p. 2). From this perspective, education provides tools to 'deal with the future' economically and offers a social and cultural tools to build peace and a better society after a conflict abates.

While students and their parents often associate education with hope for the future (Winthrop & Kirk, 2008), Dryden-Peterson (2011a) points out that there is little evidence indicating that refugee education actually contributes to healthy and productive economic futures:

> Yet what do school experiences of refugee children and parents indicate about the accuracy of this faith? There are no global data on the learning outcomes of refugees or of the pathways between primary and secondary school and secure adult livelihoods for refugees. As mentioned earlier, there is clear evidence that most children in low-income countries are learning little in school, and often even less in conflict-affected countries…there is no reason to believe that outcomes would be different among refugees, on average. (p. 59)

In fact, Dryden-Peterson argues quite effectively in her lengthy review of UNHCR education that refugee education, particularly in its current state, does not generally help children make connections between schooling and future livelihoods. Rather, Dryden-Peterson (2015b**)** has pointed to the low-quality of refugee education around the globe.

According to Dryden-Peterson (2011a), the existence of education is not sufficient for economic development nor is economic development the only goal; rather, for education to make a difference in the future, it must be of high quality and contribute to personal and social development, too. Others share this sentiment, that education should be of high quality and should promote personal development. Education should "foster durable solutions by promoting self-reliance, social and economic development. Education provides the human and social capital needed for reintegration in the country of origin or local integration in the host country. Appropriate education builds the foundations for social cohesion, peace and justice" (UNHCR, 2007, p. 415). The UDHR states that "education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms" (UN, 1948, article 26). That is, in addition to preparing students with technical skills, for education to contribute to economic development, it should prepare students holistically for their life after conflict. Education should use a range of pedagogies and modalities that encourage students to identify and develop their talents and skills and cultivate healthy self-esteem. Furthermore, these conventions affirm that education should "enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups" (UN, 1966, article 13).

Not only should education provide students with knowledge and skills to participate in society, but the education itself should also promote a free society that respects the human rights of all its citizens. Emphasizing this type of education, often referred to as Human Rights Education (HRE), in emergency situations again points to the efforts made by learners look to the future and develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes that will cultivate a peaceful future that values equality and rights for all. HRE is a key component of education for peace and citizenship and aims to instill values such as respect, empathy, tolerance, and cooperation (Sinclair, 2002). Embedded in these calls for high quality education is the notion that education will lead to social and economic development of the refugee community. The policies and documents guiding refugee education rarely account for the interests of the community, but rather, are guided by norms and priorities of economic development.

Underlying these three discourses—education as a human right, education as protective, and education for development—is an instrumentalist approach to education. That is, education is valued for its utilitarian benefits of contributing to economic development (of the individual or society), upholding certain rights, and protecting the student physically, cognitively, and emotionally. While there is some merit to considering the desired outcomes from the implementation of refugee education, such an approach in scholarship limits the research to evaluative goals. Scholars look at what educational programs exist, how they function, and what is working. While these studies are often able to provide clear policy recommendations, they tend to look at policies as technical, rational, and authoritative documents used to solve problems and make change. They uphold policies as static documents and examine them from a top-down perspective,

rather than considering the way education is provided on the ground and how the policies are negotiated, applied and interpreted by local actors (Sutton & Levinson, 2001). Additionally, this body of literature prescribes what education should be like without necessarily incorporating the opinions of refugees themselves.

Making Meaning of the Refugee Schooling Experience

In contrast to the previous body of literature which centers on an instrumental approach to refugee education, in this section I will highlight a body of refugee education scholars who focus on individual refugees and teachers of refugees and how they construct meaning around ideas of education for refugees in a country of first asylum; in other words, they use a constructivist approach to explore how refugees and their teachers understand refugee education. These scholars move away from a normative and prescriptive lens to understand how refugee children "in particular places, at particular times, fashion meaning out of events and phenomena" (Schwandt, 1998, p. 222). In this case, the focus in on how these children make meaning of their schooling experiences. Notably, scholars who use a constructivist approach introduce the voices of refugees and their teachers, which was missing in the earlier scholarship. Through qualitative studies, primarily ethnographic, these scholars aim to show how refugees themselves understand their world and make meaning of the activities and conditions around them. Many, though not all, use their research to make recommendations for refugee education policy. Yet, as I will argue, reliance on a constructivist approach alone does not sufficiently acknowledge or account for the political and ideological influences on and the structural constrains of these social realities.

In her chapter entitled *Refugee Children Aspiring for the Future*, Dryden-Peterson (2011b) highlights three roles that refugee children ascribe to their education: security, integration, and future aspirations. In this section, I will use these three categories to illuminate how multiple scholars address these three topics and the meanings that refugee children construct around them in the context of their education.

Security

While the instrumentalist scholars assert that education provides security, constructivist scholars show how students and teachers understand and experience education as providing a sense of physical protection that offers "feelings of safety and freedom" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011b, p. 95). Dryden-Peterson (2011b) asserts that it is the security that students feel in school that enables them to imagine their futures. In contrast to scholars in the first body of literature, scholars like Dryden-Peterson (2011b) and Karanja (2010) investigate how students themselves understand security and protection of schooling. They show that different children have very different understandings of what security means and how it is (or is not) offered through school. Dryden-Peterson (2011b) shares the understandings of security as held by three refugee children in Uganda, Annette, Julie, and Amaziah. Annette explained that school was a place where she could feel safe from the violence she had witnessed in the Democratic Republic of Congo, where she was born. This sense of security provides a sense of safety that allows Annette to think about her future. For Julie, school provides an "overwhelming feeling of security and happiness" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011b, p. 96), despite the xenophobia she experiences is Uganda. Julie puts herself in danger for the hour long walk to and from school each day in exchange for the sense of safety she feels in school and the hope that gives her for

her future. Amaziah, however, has faced significant challenges in attending school, due to financial hardships and inability to pay registration fees and buy a school uniform. His experience "leaves him feeling helpless—and insecure" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011b, p. 96). While security was something the three children desired and hoped they would find in school, they experience it very differently.

In her study of the Baraka school, a school for Sudanese refugees in Kenya, Karanja (2010) also notes the importance of security in education, as expressed by the children in the school. She wrote:

> Baraka school also acted as a safety net for the students, offering them a sense of security and belonging. The students expressed a sense of safety in being among other students, and some teachers, with whom they shared the same culture and language. (p. 150)

Karanja points out, however, that this sense of security felt by students is also contradicted by feelings of insecurity. She notes that the school itself is located near a busy road and students explained that they had seen vehicles have occasionally swerved off the road and come close to hitting students. The school is also located near a landfill, a possible health hazard to students. Additionally, the school building itself is made from iron sheeting and, thus, the classroom temperature ranges from very hot to very cold, leaving the students physically uncomfortable and potentially unsafe.

Akesson (2015) illustrates, through her study of children's and parent's views, a more fluid concept of security offered through schools. She argues that schools are seen as "a safe physical place…Yet school can also be a place of violence for some children" (p. 192). Akesson's ethnographic study of Palestinian children in different sites around

the West Bank and East Jerusalem draws on a theory of place to examine children's experiences with school as a physical location, a place of activity, and a place of meaning (p. 198). She finds that different children relate differently to their schools, based on their life experiences and histories. Some children fear the checkpoints they face on their way to and from school, and others worry about harassment from Israeli settlers, and both serve to create a culture of fear among the children in her study. Other children and parents report that school was an important place to prepare young people for the future economically. It is also seen by some as a tool to resist occupation and uphold the Palestinian struggle. She gives the example of Sanaa, a 23 year old university student who fights with the police as she is being evicted from her house, saying that she needs to get her books and go to school. Akesson also notes that several parents assert that education will enable students to support their communities and, thus, resist the occupation.

In their discussion of safety and security, Dryden-Peterson (2011b), Karanja (2010) and Akesson (2015) each challenge the common wisdom that education necessarily provides physical and emotional security for refugee children. Their research aligns with Bush and Saltarelli's (2000) notion of 'two faces' of education, that it can be both positive and negative. Dryden-Peterson, Karanja, and Akesson illustrate how students perceive education both as protective, but also as having potential dangers and insecurities.

Yet the constructivist nature of their studies, focusing on the meaning students and parents attribute to education, limits to some degree what scholars can say about the situation more broadly. These studies discussed above certainly illustrate the connections

students make between feeling safe in school and future livelihood possibilities. That is, they show how refugee children believe that despite the physical dangers they may face, schooling will have positive contributions to their future livelihoods: "Education can promote current physical security and the promise of future economic security" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011b, p. 98). These conclusions, however, focus largely on the ways that students *understand* their education and give limited attention to the social and political factors that may or may not contribute to that reality. These insights can be further extended to examine what security means and imagine alternatives to the ways that students and teachers understand notions of protection and security.

Integration

A second role of education that emerges through research with youth about education is the notion of integration. This theme is particularly salient for this study and provides insight into the ideas and understandings of integration. Dryden-Peterson (2006b, 2011b) asserts that the aspiration for integration into the host society is often embedded in schooling practices and sought out through the pursuit of education. This often occurs through structural integration, where refugee children and youth are taught the state curriculum, in the local language, by local teachers. Many refugees see value in learning the local language, which supports and facilitates their integration into local society (Dryden-Peterson, 2006b, 2011b). However, often the local language is taught solely through immersion, often leaving studenst confused in their schoolwork and ultimately hindering their learning. Dryden-Peterson points to Annette, a secondary student who is willing to return to primary school in order to learn English and acquire a certificate of education from Uganda, "a skill and an educational qualification that she

believes will facilitate employment in the host society" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011b, p. 96). While students express frustration at the linguistic and curricular differences in host-country schools, students and parents alike remain hopeful that children will learn the local language and be able to integrate (Dryden-Peterson, 2006b). In Karanja's study (2010), students at the Baraka school expressed satisfaction with the use of the local Kenyan curriculum rather than that of the home country. Karanja wrote that students believed the curriculum "was not only meeting their present educational needs but would enable them to meet their future goals" (p. 151). These studies show that youth generally believe that learning the local language and adapting to the local curriculum allows refugee youth to connect their present condition to a prosperous future.

For refugees, education also plays a role in their integration through the social, cultural and political contributions they make to the host communities and local refugee communities. Refugees join together to provide social support for each other in contexts where services may be lacking or difficult to access. In order to overcome school registration costs and hidden schooling fees, refugees frequently establish community-run schools and daycares for children and youth (Dryden-Peterson, 2006; Grabska, 2006; Karanja, 2010).

Dryden-Peterson (2006a) tells the story of Bauma Benjamin and Kwabo Fostin, two refugees in Uganda from the Democratic Republic of Congo, who found the Kampala Urban Refugee Children's Education Centre (KURCEC), a community-based school. While the school is intended for refugee children, they find that local children who cannot afford to attend other schools also enroll in KURCEC. Dryden-Peterson argues that their ability to overcome challenges, including ongoing threats from the

Ugandan government to close down the school, demonstrates a struggle for self-reliance. Moreover, she argues that Bauma and Kwabo exhibited agency in establishing the school, "derived in part from their beliefs about individual responsibility…and their sense of responsibility to this refugee community urged them to teach its children voluntarily despite the difficulties posed for their individual self-sufficiency" (p. 389-390). Their agency led to social change for all individuals involved, students, teachers, and founders, along with the greater urban refugee community.

While this literature advanced our thinking about integration and the perceived benefits and challenges, it could be extended with discussions of social, economic, and policy constraints on the possibilities and experiences of integration. While many refugees ascribe integration and future possibilities to education (Mendenhall et al., 2015), scholars in this body of literature do not always address the limited reality of that dream. While they broadly address the polices that constrain refugees from obtaining jobs, the policies are not connected to meanings constructed around education. In Dryden-Peterson's (2006a) account of Benjamin and Fostin, the two refugee men who established a school for their community, she describes them as agents of social change in their community, building community for the refugees. Yet, the very reason why they even had to establish a school for refugees is because refugees in Uganda do not have full access to education. Thus, while schooling may establish a community for refugees and provide knowledge and skills refugees could use in the future, the possibility of integration is null. Some of this work has been extended, like, for example, Bellino and Dryden-Peterson's (2018) theorizing of integrating "up" and "down," which I will discuss in a later section of this review.

Future Aspirations

The third role of education used in this body of research is the connection that children and parents make between education and future aspirations. Dryden-Peterson (2011b) argues that the developmental phase of childhood places them in a "future-oriented position" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011b, p. 87) despite the uncertainty they may experience as refugees. Furthermore, she asserts that young people around the world are socialized to connect formal schooling to these future aspirations. As such, she argues that despite the space of limbo in which many refugee children and youth find themselves, education provides a site where young people foster hope for their future. Dryden-Peterson (2011b) states unequivocally that "the content of future aspirations is inextricably connected to the type of current educational experience a child has and the meaning the child ascribes to it" (p. 97). For Annette and Julie, two refugee students in her study, education provides skills and knowledge that they believe will lead to a secure social and economic position. Furthermore, attending formal schooling offers a space where they are able to think about future possibilities.

In her study surveying Palestinian youth across five locations, Chatty (2009) finds that education plays an important role in youth's "aspirations for a better personal and community future" (p. 338). Although she touches on a holistic notion of the future, the examples she gives still focus on economic futures. For example, Palestinian youth in Lebanon express that remaining in school will improve their job prospects and youth in the West Bank see education as a tool that will lead to "fulfilling and productive lives" (p. 334). Karanja (2010), too, illustrates that students at the Baraka school connected schooling to their future and that "they were hopeful that education would pave way for a

bright future" (p. 152). Her references to the future are usually generic, not specifying what aspect of 'the future' children aspire to. In her conclusion, she does recommend that school curricula for refugees address "practical knowledge and skills…through basic vocational training" and other areas which children "can use to make a living" (p. 153). This is coupled with a recognition of life skills and values education that would "enrich the students' lives while at school and the lives of their community members thereafter" (p. 153). Madaad and Matthews (2018) also point to the ways that education for Syrian refugees in Lebanon, despite its challenges, sustains and promotes hope for refugee children.

Grayson (2017) complicates the idea of education and aspirations by showing how, on the one hand, refugee youth position education as central for "transcending their condition and achieving a fulfilling life" (p. 73). On the other hand, she points to the ways that camp life makes educational achievement difficult and, despite the hope it provided, life after education "feels worse" (p. 80) when the promises of education do not come to fruition.

Ethnographic research with Sudanese refugee women in Cairo, Egypt conducted by G. Johnson (2013) demonstrates a connection between violence, education and future aspirations. Johnson describes violent conditions that female refugees face in Cairo, including "daily discrimination and harassment…unwanted solicitations for sex on the streets by men who call them prostitutes…[and] credible and frightening rumors of rape" (p. 75). Yet the women in Johnson's study endure such violence and harassment to attend English classes. As she explains, they attend English classes despite violence "in an effort to better position themselves in their future imagined lives in Sudan, South

Sudan, or a third, English-speaking country" (p. 80). That is, they understand the process of learning English as a means toward achieving their vocational aspirations.

The constructivist approach to examining refugee education, which centers the voices of refugee youth and their experiences of education and understandings of its connection to security, integration, and future possibilities, enriches and complicates the dominant discourses of protection and development by illuminating ways that refugees themselves understand these ideas. While many children view school as a safe and secure space, scholars also show that is not always the case (Akesson, 2015; Grayson, 2017; G. Johnson, 2013). This approach is distinctly different from the previous, instrumentalist approach in its tone. The first body of literature I addressed highlights an instrumental and normative attitude towards education, prescribing what education should be and do. In contrast, this constructivist body of literature offers evidence from refugees themselves, showing how education does and does not align with those ideals. That is, these scholars bring in the voices of refugees who say that education can be protective, can help them integrate into society, and can assist them in achieving their aspirations. This literature has contributed to the movement towards education in emergencies and Dryden-Peterson (2011b) and Karanja (2010) both include explicit policy recommendations. This aligns with the assertion of several Refugee Studies scholars that "research *about* refugees should be used *for* refugees" (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al., 2014, p. 2) or what Jacobsen and Landau (2003) call the "dual imperative of refugee research," that it be academically sound and policy relevant.

While this body of scholarship is important in bringing in refugee voices, it does not fully account for ways that meaning is constructed by unequal power relations in

societies. It does not connect the ways that refugee children and youth make meaning of their schooling experiences to larger social and political processes such as the possibilities of actualizing livelihoods and career goals and the possibilities of political recognition and citizenship. While some scholars touched on the legal and social barriers that refugees face in countries of asylum, this information is provided as context and not always drawn into the analysis. The focus of this body of work remains on the agency of refugees to make their own decisions regarding their futures. As Appadurai (1996) contends, though there often is an illusion of agency, the individual is actually a "chooser" of alternatives put forth by a social, political, or economic system (as cited by K. Johnson, 2013). There is little mention of the coercive factors at play that shape refugees' strategies and decision-making techniques. Rather, the emphasis is on the decisions they make and the way refugees are able to make positive changes in their own lives. While this research is valuable in its move to work with refugee children and youth and include their voices in the scholarship, I contend that it does not pay enough attention to the ways that policies and discourses act in practice to restrict possibilities for refugee youth. As such, I turn to a third body of literature which will drive my own research forward.

Critical Approaches to Refugee Education

Through the analyses above, I have identified the leading discourses in the field of refugee education and showed how they have shaped the field. Additionally, I have discussed how constructivist scholars move away from a generic notion of the refugee and her experience with schooling and towards the agency of refugees to make decisions

and construct their futures. In this dissertation, I draw on much of this latter work while taking a more critical approach to refugee education. I look at the intersection of refugee experiences and the structural, social, and economic constraints they face in society. I understand education as a site of struggle where social practices and ideologies are produced, reproduced and transformed (Popkewitz, 1999). That is, critical theorists view education as situated within "unequal relations of power in the larger society and in the relations of exploitation, dominance, and subordination—and the conflicts—that generate and are generated by these realities" (Apple, 2013, p. 5). As I introduced in Chapter One, use the theory of cultural production in this dissertation to illuminate the tensions between dominant hegemonic ideologies and the resistance of students and teachers (Giroux, 1983) to produce new cultural forms. Cultural production allows me to examine ways that "human agency operates under powerful structural constraints" (Levinson, Foley, & Holland, 1996, p. 14).

In this section, I draw on qualitative studies that take a critical approach to examine refugee education in contexts of asylum and in contexts of resettlement in the United States and Australia. First, I review literature that focuses on the intersection of policy and practice in contexts of asylum. Second, I examine approaches to understanding curriculum and pedagogy, particularly in contexts of resettlement, but not entirely. Finally, I illustrate ways that scholars have examined and understood integration and inclusion of refugees in educational contexts.

Policies as Enabling and Constraining Refugee Education Practice

The first way that scholars have drawn on critical theory to understand refugee education is by examining the ways that policy and social structures both constrain and

enable the practices and experiences of refugee education. Dryden-Peterson (2016) points to the tension between normative international policies and frameworks of refugee education which assert that all refugees have the right to education and the institutions that implement those policies as centered in nation-states with their own national interests. She argues that while refugees increasingly have access to their right to education, the potential "for education to contribute to the well-being of individual refugees, to their host countries, and to their conflict-affected countries of origin" (p. 479) is limited without greater citizenship rights that would allow them to participate socially, politically, and economically. Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) illustrate the multiple ways that refugee education policy gets taken up and appropriated in practice at multiple levels (Sutton & Levinson, 2001), giving varied meaning to the purpose of refugee education. They show that at the global level, the purpose of refugee education is to ensure every child's right to access quality education and inclusive education is a mechanism to achieve that goal. At the national level, approaches to inclusive refugee education varied based on an understanding of refugees' futures. That is, those national policies that resisted inclusive education saw refugee futures as elsewhere, some national policies of inclusion reflected a pragmatism towards the provision of education, and other national policies of inclusion viewed inclusion as a means towards long-term integration. At the local level, the tensions between varying goals of education played out in practice as quality of education was often low and notions of belonging among refugees were limited.

The work of K. Johnson (2013) and Allaf and Washington (2013) also show how pressure from international educational frameworks and policies shape the provision of

education in different and problematic ways. K. Johnson (2013) looks at the influence of Education for All on the Thai government, which led the government to authorize previously underground schools for undocumented Burmese migrants in Thailand. In doing so, she also illustrates how policy can serve as a tool of governance that shapes individuals and their educational experiences (Shore & Wright, 1997). She shows how the Thai government, however, navigated the call for educational access by controlling what is taught in the schools for Burmese migrants. On the one hand, the government insisted that these schools use most of the Thai curriculum, translated into Burmese, to ensure a level of control over what students are learning. On the other, the government prohibited the underground Burmese schools from teaching about Thai history as a means of preventing the students from developing any attachment to Thailand. This, combined with schooling in the Burmese language and a lack of accreditation for the schools enables the Thai government to provide all populations access to education while simultaneously highlighting differences within the population. Further, by discouraging any learning about Thailand, these policies promote a lack of belonging among the children and, instead, encourages their identification as Burmese, Karen, or simply as undocumented students.

In their study of education for Iraqi refugees in Jordan, Allaf and Washington (2013) assert that pressure from the international community to provide education to Iraqi refugees led to an educational policy that was inappropriate for refugee youth. They contend that the GoJ established an educational policy of integration rather than segregation to make Iraqi refugees governable subjects. That is, by including them in the national education system, the GoJ hoped it would be able to control refugees' conduct.

Yet, they argue that what resulted was actually increased tension and resentment between Jordanian and Iraqi populations in the country.

In contrast to the policy of educational integration in Jordan for Iraqi refugees, Shabaneh (2012) analyzes the influence educational segregation for camp-based Palestinian refugees into schools supported by UNRWA, the UN agency that supports Palestinians. He argues that UNRWA's educational activities oriented towards Palestinian history, cultural and politics unintentionally cultivated the growth of Palestinian identity and the reconstruction of national identity among Palestinians in camps. Fincham (2012), in contrast, reminds us that while schools play an important role in culturally and symbolically producing Palestinianess, national identity is fluid and influenced by various formal and informal institutions. Fincham (2012) argues that although institutional power, processes and outcomes may construct shared notions of Palestinianess, they are also sites of struggle and resistance around those ideas.

Curriculum and Pedagogy in Refugee Education

A second critical approach to understanding refugee education is through analyses of curriculum and pedagogy. Scholars have explored ways that pedagogical approaches and curricular content can reflect and engage refugee and immigrant students while respecting the transnational lives that they lead, with a focus on newcomers in the United States (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017; Bajaj, Argenal, & Canlas, 2017; Bajaj, Canlas, & Arjenal, 2017; Mendenhall, Bartlett, & Ghaffar-Kucher, 2017). While this literature is useful in framing this study, it is important to recognize the structural and political differences between refugees in the United States and in countries of first asylum: namely, the former have a clear pathway to citizenship and the rights and responsibilities embedded within

citizenship while the latter do not. Scholars also identify limitations and challenges that teachers face in implementing appropriate pedagogy and curriculum for refugee students, both in the United States and in countries of asylum (Magee & Pherali, 2017; Mendenhall et al., 2015; Hos, 2016).

In examining pedagogies and curriculum for refugee youth, scholars have identified several approaches that support refugees' academic achievement while reflecting and engaging the transnational lives that they lead and the diverse range of experiences they have had. First, scholars identified the importance of cultivating critical consciousness among newcomer and refugee students, that is, the knowledge and skills to recognize oppression and take action to transform inequalities in society (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017; Bajaj, Argenal, & Canlas, 2017; Magee & Pherali, 2017). They did this by supporting students to reflect critically social inequalities in the US and in their home communities (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017; Bajaj et al., 2017) and promoting civic engagement through experiential learning that fosters the acquisition of skills necessary for participatory democracy (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017). Participation in Human Rights Education offered students opportunities to examine their past and present realities, reflect on their own experiences with human rights violations, and build "critical awareness of access to rights and resources amid unequal forms of citizenship" (Bajaj, Canlas, & Argenal, 2017, p. 125). Magee and Pherali (2017) argue that in the case of critical pedagogy use in Jordan, efforts of raising critical consciousness are limited the commonly held notions that this approach runs contrary to educational certification and results in the use of teacher-centered pedagogies instead.

Second, scholars have employed critical pedagogy to highlight the importance of educator support and care for academics and beyond (Hos, 2016; Mendenhall at al., 2017). They argue that such care and support play an essential role in developing student confidence and supporting their social-emotional well-being.

Third, scholars have highlighted the benefits of supporting students' languages and literacies (Mendenhall et al., 2017), or what Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) have identified as translanguaging. By translanguaging they refer to a "respect for and cultivation of all the linguistic and cultural repertoires that a student brings" (p. 29). Teachers support translanguaging in multiple ways including supporting learning in multiple languages (not only English) (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017) and allowing students to draw on their native languages to support content learning (Mendenhall et al., 2017).

A fourth component of teaching and learning for refugees that scholars identified is the cultivation of "multidirectional aspirations," that is, preparing youth for transnational post-secondary options including work and study (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017, p. 32). In their study, Bajaj and Bartlett show schools do this in multiple ways including supporting translanguaging, expanding the curriculum beyond a focus on the United States, and supporting guidance counselors who are knowledgeable of the diverse possibilities and willing to work with you to investigate them. Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) also note that preparation for transnational futures is one purpose of refugee education and requires developing skills, knowledge and competencies for a wide range of opportunities along with the maintenance of the language and culture of the country of origin.

These approaches to pedagogy and curriculum for refugee youth are not without their challenges and shortcomings. Teachers of refugees in the United States and in countries of asylum may face limited abilities to implement innovative teaching approaches. Mendenhall et al. (2015) and Hos (2016) point to lack of teacher training as a major impediment to implementing student-centered and participatory approaches. They also found that limited material resources and lack of teaching and learning materials also constrained teachers' abilities to innovate in their teaching approaches or curricular materials. Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) highlight challenges in implementing a critical curriculum, including difficulties in supporting translanguaging competencies and students' unfamiliarity with critical thinking and creativity in the classroom. Magee and Pherali (2017) also point to the challenges of completing the curriculum in a limited time period as a restriction to implementing creativity in teaching.

Inclusion and Integration in Refugee Education

A third critical approach to understanding refugee education focuses on the inclusion of refugees into national school systems. Some scholars have drawn on the lens of inclusive education to examine the inclusion of refugees into national, mainstream classrooms (Block et al., 2014; Edwards, 2017; Olagookun & White, 2017; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). While inclusive education is often thought of as an approach to supporting children with disabilities, it is increasingly being seen as an approach to supporting education for a wide range of marginalized groups (see Schuelka, Johnstone, Thomas, & Artiles, forthcoming). In this context, Singh (2012) defines inclusive education as an approach that "seeks to address the learning needs of all children, youth and adults with a

specific focus on those who are vulnerable to marginalization and exclusion. It implies all learners, young people-with or without disabilities being able to learn together" (p. 157).

Yet, several scholars argue that refugees included in national education systems face a sense of "inclusive exclusion" in that they are physically integrated but still marginalized in the classrooms (Olaggokun & White, 2017, p. 99). Marginalization of refugees in mainstream schools and classrooms may take the form of social ostracism, exclusion due to limited language ability, or the perpetuation of racism and prejudice towards refugees (Olaggokun & White, 2017; Sidhu, Taylor, & Christie, 2011; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). Without the appropriate tools and mechanisms in schools to support them, refugees will continue to be excluded, despite their physical inclusion. Sidhu, Taylor and Christie (2011) found that inclusive refugee education in Australia is discursively positioned within broader educational policies that lumps refugees into a broad category with other migrants and English language learners, thereby not accounting for refugees' unique learning needs. They argue that this discursive technique marginalizes refugees in inclusive education and places them at a further disadvantage.

A few articles have looked specifically at the integration of refugees into national education systems in countries of first asylum (Bellino & Dryden-Peterson, 2018; Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018; Dryden-Peterson et al., under review). They distinguish between structural integration, where refugees have access to national education systems through the use of the curriculum, national language and national teachers, and relational integration, "a sociocultural process, related to identity development and transformation; it includes both an individual-level sense of belonging, or connectedness, as well as group-level social cohesion" (Dryden-Peterson et al., p. 10). They argue that there are

competing visions, rationales, and understandings of inclusion into national educational systems and its purposes which complicate efforts towards inclusion.

Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) demonstrate that education actors at varying levels-global, national, and local-have varied understandings of the purposes of refugee education, which leads to different approaches to inclusion. They show that at the school level, access to quality education through any model of inclusive education is limited and refugees face challenges to belonging. Bellino and Dryden-Peterson (2018) theorize that educational integration is multidirectional and hierarchical, with a few refugees integrating "up" into government schools and the majority of refugees integrating "down" into segregated camp-based schools, highlighting the tensions between different approaches to inclusive education. They argue that integrating "down" gives refugees access to lower quality education, yet in an environment that better targets their needs and in which they feel a greater sense of belonging. Similarly Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) ague although the inclusion of refuge youth into national systems has the potential to cultivate belonging, prospects of belonging at the school level are tenuous. This lack of belonging demonstrated through inclusive refugee education reinforces uncertainty and exclusion that refugees face. Thus they show that while including refugees in national education systems is premised on creating future opportunities for refugees, the low quality of education and the lack of prospects for belonging limits the opportunities refugees have for any possible future.

Schooling in the Middle East: Education for What?

In this final section, I will review the literature on education in the Middle East to contextualize my study regionally and also provide a framework for looking specifically at education in the Middle East. While the previous body of literature serves as a basis to understand how refugees may be constructed in society, and provides an approach for examining their making and self making, this final section on schooling in the Middle East helped me to apply this approach to education.

As I illustrated earlier in this chapter, one of the dominant discourses surrounding refugee education claims that education will lead to social and economic development. This trope is not unique to refugee contexts and, indeed, appears frequently in the development literature. Hererra (2003) and Mazawi (1999) argue that studies of education in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) are driven by "outmoded human capital, modernization and functionalist approaches that assume that omnipotent states orchestrate all significant educational activity" (Hererra, 2003, pp. 168-169). Moreover, they argue that educational studies in the region tend to privilege the role of the state in determining education outcomes while devaluing the power of civil society in influencing the practices and processes of schooling (Hererra, 2006; Mazawi, 1999; Mazawi, 2002; Shirazi, 2009). Yet a growing number of scholars have illustrated that schools are not merely a site of regulation and reproduction (Adely, 2004), but they are actually a space where cultural practices and politics are negotiated (Boutieri, 2016; Shirazi, 2012; Starrett 1998). Critical ethnographic research at the school level in the MENA region thus serves to decenters the state from political dominance and, instead, highlights the ways that teachers, students, and school administrators subtly (or not so subtly) negotiate and

subvert dominant educational narratives. Through examinations of the micro-practices of schooling, they make visible the connections to local cultural practices, politics and power. As Hererra (2006) argues, "far from functioning as a static social institution under the domination of a hegemonic state, the school represents a potentially dynamic site of political and cultural struggle and social transformation" (p. 26). In this section I will demonstrate how schools serve as a site for students to negotiate their own identities in light of dominant narratives about education. In particular, I will focus on the discourse of education and nation building and that of education and development.

Education and Nation Building in the Middle East

As I mentioned in Chapter One, Jordanian schools are a central institution for the construction of a national subject who is loyal to the Hashemite regime (Adely, 2010; Shirazi, 2009). National symbols are present throughout schools, and students are expected to participate in patriotic rituals meant to further inculcate a Jordanian identity. Yet, despite these heavy-handed efforts to instill a sense of Jordanian identity in students, Shirazi and Adely demonstrate the ambiguity in national symbols, allowing a space to challenge and negotiate their meanings by both students and teachers. Hererra (2006), too, illustrates how some Islamic schools in Egypt use patriotic rituals meant to build national identity to actually provide alternative, Islamic identities for students.

Shirazi (2009, 2012), Adely (2010, 2012), and Hererra (2009) analyze the *taboor* as one venue through which students, teachers and school administrators challenge the "dissemination of state narratives" (Shirazi, 2009, pp. 93-94). The *taboor* is a daily patriotic ritual mandated by both the Jordanian and Egyptian state to be performed by students in schools. While the morning assembly varies slightly by country, it usually

entails calisthenics, Quran reading, daily announcements, flag saluting and singing the national anthem. In Shirazi's research in two high schools for boys, he observed multiple ways that boys disrupt the morning ritual, by acting out, mocking the rituals and often making other students laugh. He also pointed to ways that teachers devalue the *taboor* through lack of attendance or disinterest in the ritual. If the 'correct' performance of the *taboor* indicates Jordanian-ness and authorizes the parameters of Jordanian identity, subversion of the ritual, then, can work to destabilize the state discourse of belonging (Shirazi, 2009, 2012). Adely and Shirazi both point to ways that some teachers and school administrators strictly monitor the students during the *taboor*, pacing between the rows of students wielding sticks or wooden rods, frequently shushing misbehaving students, or yelling at them for a lack of participation or enthusiasm. Adely (2010) argues that the need for discipline during the *taboor* indicates the "wavering ground on which the legitimacy narrative being enacted stood" (p. 135).

While teachers reprimand the girls in Adely's (2010, 2012) study for not singing loud enough during the *taboor*, some girls (particularly the more religious ones) assert that singing loudly posed a moral dilemma as it went against their religious beliefs about modesty. That is, some believe that a female Muslim should not raise her voice, particularly in front of men. This tension, between the national ideal of participation in the *taboor* and the religious ideal of modesty, then, also calls into question the legitimacy of the state ideology as it is put in competition with other moral (religious) projects. Hererra (2006) also showed how Islam was put to work during the *taboor* to challenge state authority and the national narrative. Private Islamic schools in Egypt are under the authority of the Ministry of Education and, as such, required to teach the state curriculum

and conduct the mandated *taboor* ritual. The Fatima School for Believers, a private Islamic school where Hererra conducted her research, carries out the morning *taboor* like the Ministry demands. The school administration, however, views saluting the flag and singing the national anthem, *Biladi, Biladi* (my country, my country) akin to idol worship and, as such, they sing an alternative anthem, '*Illahi, Illahi'* (my god, my god). The alternative anthem, sung at Muslim Brotherhood meetings, uses the same melody and cadence as the national anthem, but carries a religious and revolutionary tone. Thus, the Fatima School for Believers also subverts the national narrative and provides students with an alternative, religious narrative.

The different ways that students and teachers subvert the *taboor* ritual complicates the idea of the state fully determining schooling and, instead, points to ways that schools can serve as sites for the construction and navigation of meaning. Although education in Middle Eastern countries is heavily centralized and controlled, these scholars illuminate the ways that students and teachers challenge that control and challenge, contradict, and resist dominant state ideologies.

Education for Development in the Middle East

Schooling is often upheld as an essential tool for modernization and development in the Middle East. Shirazi (2009) writes that discourses of education "liken schooling as a key determinant of individual economic mobility, national development, and regional security" (p. 43). Adely (2012) explains that common discourses about girls' education in the Middle East assert that education will "unfold along a single, universal path—that of delaying and reducing family obligations in order to enter the paid workforce" (p. 14). Yet both Shirazi (2009, 2015) and Adely (2004, 2009, 2012) argue that the situation is, in

fact, not as simple as it is laid out in these main narratives. Instead, they point to the multiple and sometimes conflicting elements at play as young people envision (and actualize) their economic futures.

In Shirazi's (2009) ethnographic study of high school boys in Jordan, he reveals complexity and often ambivalence in the way that boys perceive education as contributing to their future employment. While some claim that education helps build important personality traits and enables them to invest in their futures, other question the way that education will do so. Some see their *tawjihi* score, the high school exit exam, as a greater determinant in their economic future than their high school education. Others value their education, but recognizing the limited job opportunities in Jordan, they imagine their futures abroad.

Shirazi (2009, 2015) also notes the importance of *wasta* in informing future plans and perceptions of opportunities. The prevalence of *wasta*, which refers to both social connections and the social practice of a well-connected individual interceding on one's behalf, calls into question the discourse of equal opportunity. The necessity of *wasta* for obtaining certain professional opportunities, especially higher ranking jobs within the public sector, upholds the social hierarchy of the country and undermines the potential power of education. This, then, raises questions about the future possibilities of Syrian refugee youth who may not have the *wasta* necessary to succeed in Jordan. If they can obtain a high quality education and pass the *tawjihi,* the Jordanian exit exam required to graduate high school, will they have the connections they need to obtain employment?

Adely (2004, 2012) highlights a tension in the education for development project between tradition and modernity. Women are held up as markers of 'tradition,' but

development narratives often center around education for women as bringing them into 'modernity.' Schools, then, represent a site where the modern/traditional discourse is negotiated. Some of the girls in Adely's (2012) study see that education can help them get a job, make a living and contribute to their family's economic situation. They also see that education as a social marker makes them more attractive as a marriage partner. Yet, while this discourse of education for development upholds that schooling is essential for women to participate in the labor market, there are still limited opportunities for girls and women in Jordan to be in the public sphere. Moreover, as unemployment rates in Jordan remain high, girls also recognize the restrictions on their professional possibilities (Adely, 2012a; World Bank, 2018).

The first two bodies of literature addressed in this chapter assert that education for refugees is essential in conceptualizing their future. In the context of Jordan, however, Adely (2004, 2012) and Shirazi (2009, 2015) highlight persistent economic challenges in Jordan to illustrate that this might not always be the case. Though facing the same rising costs of living and growing wealth disparities, Syrian refugees in Jordan have even fewer professional opportunities than Jordanians given the current legal restrictions on their employability and social biases against Syrians. Thus, another line of inquiry could investigate how Syrian refugees understand their future employment and economic prospects vis a vis dominant narratives that glorify education's role in helping them actualize their future aspirations.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have introduced three different approaches to studying and discussing refugee education. The first approach, which represents the dominant discourses in the field, revolves heavily around formal conventions and reports asserting the importance of education in times of crisis and emergency. This literature offers a normative lens on refugee education, asserting that it is a fundamental human right that provides protection and contributes to individual social and economic development. A second approach to understanding refugee education explores the experiences of refugee education through the eyes of students and parents themselves. This body of literature seeks to understand how refugee children and youth make meaning of their schooling. I argued that sharing refugee stories without considering the power dynamics involved in creating those stories and experiences misses and important piece of the puzzle. The final approach takes a critical lens and examines the ways that structures and policies constrain and enable refugee education. It also examines how refugee education, and education in the Middle East, serve as a site of struggle over dominant norms, values, and ideas, where new cultural forms are produced. By reviewing these distinct yet related studies, I have situated my study in the field of refugee education and education in the Middle East, with a particular focus on critical studies of education.

Chapter Three: Research Methodology

This chapter presents the methodological dimensions of this dissertation research along with a concrete outline of the research design. The methodological decisions I have made in shaping this critical ethnographic study stem from a critical epistemology and were guided by the research questions outlined in Chapter One. As I stated earlier, this study aims to investigate the phenomenon of inclusive refugee education and its related processes and practices as they occur in the specific context of FT classrooms in Jordan. Through this dissertation, I seek to illuminate how the policies driving inclusive refugee education—both from the state of Jordan and the UNHCR—manifest in the specific context of FT classrooms. Further, I aim to explore the experiences of these processes and practices and how they contribute to or hinder a sense of inclusion. I understand this project of having two main components: (1) generating 'thick description' of inclusive refugee education in the context of FT classrooms; and (2) an in-depth examination of student experiences of inclusion/exclusion in the centers. These two elements required an in-depth exploration through an ethnographic lens.

In this chapter, I introduce my broad methodological approach to research as well as my methodological understand of critical ethnography and the methods used to conduct this ethnographic study. I explain my approach to data analysis and writing, and I review some of the ethical and practical challenges I faced while conducting this research.

Methodology: Approaching the Research

This study drew on critical ethnography to inform my data generation[8] process and answer my proposed research questions. Through ethnography, I was able to investigate the context of inclusive refugee education and examine what took place in the FT centers and how students, teachers, and administrators made meaning of it. Through this element of the study, I focused on similarities and shared patterns to generate 'thick descriptions' of the schooling context (Geertz, 1973). Using methods of narrative analysis (which I discuss later in the chapter), I contrast these thick, generalized descriptions of the schooling context with individual stories and experiences. Together, this allowed me as the researcher, and you as my readers, to grapple with the messy and chaotic nature of inclusive refugee education as I see it.

Underlying this study is an ontological perspective that rejects the notion of a single, objective truth 'out there' in the world to be collected and analyzed by the researcher. Rather, I understand research as a dialogic process between myself as the researcher, my research participants, and the data I generated—it was a give and take that was constantly in process; even when I returned to the US, I continued to engage dialectically with my data through the analysis and writing process. I sought collaboration with my research participants to the extent possible and worked to build

[8] In this dissertation, I follow the decision of Lozenski (2014) to use the phrase "generate data" rather than "collect data." Lozenski drew on Thomson (2013) who ontologically problematized the notion of 'collecting data.' Thomson argues that the notion of collecting data implies that data is out there in the world to collect, like stamps or insects. Instead, she asserts that people and experiences "aren't data until we make them data," thus suggesting the phrase "generate data".

relationships with them in ways that would "dismantle the notion of power-over research participants wielded by the researcher and attend to ways to work…collegially and in an egalitarian matter" (Hopkins, 2009, p. 138). While I aimed for the co-construction of knowledge, this was constrained by the reality of my research opportunities and set up, which I discuss later in this chapter and the following chapter. Therefore, I recognize that the power dynamics were not ever completely eliminated, particularly in interviews with young people. Through research process and the project of writing this dissertation, I strived to remain aware of the existence of these power dynamics.

Another important aspect undergirding this study is an understanding of the subjective nature of research. That is, the data that I generated and the analysis that I produce was my own interpretation, based on my intellectual assumptions, political ideologies and personal perspectives on the world. As Stivers (1993) asserts, "There is no such thing as removing the observer from the knowledge acquisition process, since to do so would be like trying to see without eyes" (p. 410). Luttrell (2000) explains that "our role in shaping the ethnographic encounter is huge; consciously or not, we listen and make sense of what we hear according to particular theoretical, ontological, personal, and cultural frameworks and in the context of unequal power relations" (p. 499). The subjective dimension of research demands a researcher examines her own identity and continuously engage in a process of self-reflection. This reflexivity began at the proposal writing stage and continued through the data generation process.

Critical Ethnography

Ethnography is a "way of seeing" (Wolcott, 2008) that guides researchers to identify and interpret patterns of meaning-making and local practices. Critical

ethnography adds an additional lens of 'seeing', that is, the lens of critical theory. As Madison (2005) writes, critical ethnography is "critical theory in action" (p. 16). In this way, while conventional ethnography is strongly focused on "description and interpretation of cultural behaviors" of a particular group, critical ethnography does so with an eye towards uncovering unequal power relationships among social and cultural groups (Schram, 2003, p. 95). Critical ethnography seeks to expose power relationships and interrogate taken-for-granted assumptions in order to challenge the status quo and reveal hidden repression and constraints within the community being studied (Madison, 2005). According to Wolcott, ethnographic research "describe[s] what the people in some particular place or status ordinarily do, and the *meanings* they ascribe to the doing, under ordinary or particular circumstances" (p. 73). The researcher explores and interprets how individuals within a cultural group construct, share, and negotiate meaning (Glesne, 2015).

Madison asserts that critical ethnography "begins with an ethical responsibility" to investigate, expose, and address inequality and injustice (2005, p. 5). This sense of responsibility stems from the researcher's own compassion for humanity and a sense of commitment to social justice and change. It was certainly a sense of responsibility that drove me to conduct this study and investigate the educational experiences of Syrian refugees, with an eye towards identifying and exposing injustices and opportunities for improvement. Madison posits that the critical ethnographer will:

> use the resources, skills, and privileges available to her to make accessible—to penetrate the borders and break through the confines in defense of—the voices

> and experiences of subjects whose stories are otherwise restrained and out of reach. (p. 6)

As I alluded to earlier and discuss later, my use of narrative analysis and representation was my effort to elevate the voices of refugee youth, individuals who are so often the subject of political and policy discussions, yet so rarely engaged and heard.

Critical ethnography is inherently political with the goal of using knowledge towards social change. By political, I do not mean partisan: in conducting research with vulnerable populations in an authoritarian context, I had to be seen as non-political and neutral. Yet, my ultimate goal of informing and calling for action that will improve the structures and practices of refugee education is inherently political. Critical ethnographers embrace their political approach in recognizing and even embracing a certain perspective. As Thomas (1993) wrote:

> Conventional ethnographers recognize the impossibility, even undesirability, of research free of normative and other biases, but believe that these biases are to be repressed. Critical ethnographer instead celebrate their normative and political position as a means of invoking social consciousness and societal change. (p. 5).

Critical ethnographers seek social change through their research. This research was driven by a sense of responsibility and obligation to and compassion for my research participants, and a desire to leverage my knowledge for social good.

I carried out the political element of my research, not through the research process itself where I did strive to remain neutral and non-judgmental, but in the process of analysis, writing and representation. Thomas (1993) aptly compares the goal of conventional ethnography in "speaking *for* their subjects" to other researchers to the goal

of critical ethnography in speaking "*on behalf* of their subjects" to a wide audience (p. 4). That is, critical ethnographers might speak to other researchers, but also speak to teachers, to school administrators, to policy-makers, and to the general public. In doing so, they empower the voices of their research participants, giving them authority. In this way, I see my use of narrative analysis and representation as an intervention into the "static, unchanging, and enduring" notion of the refugee other by illustrating through rich narrative and complex, dynamic, and ever-changing practices and experiences of refugee youth (Madison, 2005, p. 11).

Schram (2003) identifies two "orienting concepts of ethnography," culture and contextualization (p. 96). Culture is an analytic framework applied by ethnographers and used to describe common behaviors and practices among groups of people who interact with each other regularly. I understand culture as an ongoing, productive process of meaning making that occurs through collaboration and conflict with others (Anderson-Levitt, 2012; Bartlett, Mendenhall, & Ghaffar-Kucher, 2017). It is comprised of dynamic and fluid social practices whose meanings are negotiated and interpreted (Shirazi, 2014). In examining culture, I pay attention to the way that power relations are both perpetuated and reimagined through social practices.

The second orienting concept of ethnography is contextualization, or what Peacock (2001) calls "see[ing] holistically" (p. 11). That is, ethnographers aim to look at the whole picture, not just its individual pieces. Schram (2003) notes a subtle distinction between holism and contextualization, wherein holism "points to completeness" while contextualization suggests a more dynamic process of construction. Through the lens of contextualization, the ethnographer engages in a dialectic process of examining parts and

the whole such that an understanding of the parts informs the exploration of the whole and an understanding of the whole informs the understanding of its parts.

In my study, I looked at the practice of inclusive refugee education and the processes of inclusion that emerged. I limited my study to the case of FT; yet, understood that this case was not necessarily bound by a single space, place, or group (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2019). That is, while I focused on inclusive refugee education as it was practiced and experienced within FT, I allowed my research to take me in multiple physical and metaphorical directions. In this way, I cast a wide research net that extended across FT sites (including several centers and HQ) and to the homes of select students, into the offices of refugee and education policy makers, beyond the experiences and understandings of Syrians within FT to Syrian students in public schools, other refugee populations and Jordanians. Thus, through "anthropological comparison" (Raucher, 2013, p. 24) I learned about inclusive refugee education from a range of perspectives both from within and beyond FT.

Research Sites

While I introduced FT as the overarching site of research in Chapter One, and I will elaborate on the goals and principles of the organization as well as the details of the three FT centers in which I conducted research in Chapter Four, it is important to provide a brief overview of these sites here.

My research at FT began in FT HQ, where I spent time drinking coffee and tea with the HQ staff. While I had expected the HQ staff to take greater advantage of my presence and willingness to work for them, they only ever tasked me with one project,

which entailed writing a Terms of Reference document for two consulting project they were advertising. To accomplish this project, I visited two FT education centers and the FT program in one of the refugee camps. I also closely reviewed documentation about the programs and interviewed HQ staff.

The heart of my research took place at three FT educational centers: the Hashemite Youth Center (HYC), the Rufayda Center, and the Asma Center. The HYC was my main site of research, where I spent the most time and built the strongest relationships. The Rufayda and Asma centers were secondary, but still essential to the study. As I outline later in this chapter, I also spent a significant amount of time in the world of refugee education as it existed in Jordan, gaining broad exposure to the experiences, challenges, and ideas around refugee education. Thus, as I expand upon in Chapter Four, this ethnographic study is not strictly bound by place; rather, everywhere I went and everything I experienced during my year in Jordan was ethnographic data.

Research Design: Techniques and Tools

Ethnography embraces a wide range of tools to achieve its aims. Importantly, the process demands flexibility and a willingness to change the plan of action in response to realities encountered in the field, which I did frequently (Creswell, 2014). To conduct my research, I used three primary ethnographic techniques, identified by Wolcott (2008) as experiencing, enquiring, and examining. I employed these tools in multiple settings affiliated with FT, including three educational centers, the HYC, the Rufayda Center, and the Asma Center. I elaborate on the details of the organization and the centers much more in Chapter Four. As I mentioned earlier, it should be noted that as an ethnography not

strictly bounded by place or site. Everywhere I went and everything I experienced in Jordan, ranging from conversations with taxi cab drivers, to volunteering in local agencies, to visits with Jordanian friends in their homes, was ethnographic data that informed how I understood inclusive refugee education in FT. In this section, I focus primarily on the "official" research activities.

Experiencing: Participant Observation

Participant observation is the hallmark of ethnography. It involves immersing oneself in a culture and experiencing life alongside the research participants. The researcher takes part in daily activities, rituals, and interactions as a means of studying cultural norms, processes, and behaviors. It involves building relationships and making people comfortable with the researcher's presence so she can observe information about their lives (Bernard, 2006). Wolcott (2008) asserts that participant observation has been used as a catch-all phrase for what ethnographers do in the field and, instead, uses the term 'experiencing.' For him, this aspect of field research depends on "firsthand experiences in naturally occurring events" (p. 49) and demands attentiveness to all five senses (though he claims that researchers tend to focus on sight and sound). Clandinin and Connelly (2000) explain that when researchers are in the field, they are not simply observing other people's experience, "they too are having an experience, the experience of the inquiry that entails the experience they set out to explore" (p. 81). While I was not able to experience the phenomenon of study, in this case inclusive refugee education, as students and teachers did, I did my best to understand their experiences by *being there* consistently so that participants engaged in "ordinary behavior" in the presence of the researcher (Bernard, 2006, p. 342). Of course, these efforts to understand the experiences

and processes of inclusive education were tempered by the fact that I was having my own experience in the centers, which inevitably impacted my analysis and writing.

I experienced inclusive refugee education, and FT more broadly, in multiple ways. During my first four months in Jordan (September through December, 2016), when I was taking daily Arabic lessons, I made efforts to get to know FT HQ. I did so through frequent visits to the HQ office, where I came to know several of the staff members and frequently joined them for coffee and cigarettes (theirs, not mine) in the kitchen.

My observations of inclusive refugee education in FT took place in three FT NFE centers: the HYC, the Rufayda Center, and the Asma Center. I conducted observations at the Rufayda Center and the Asma Center once a week over the course of four months. Classes at these centers ran for two hours, which was the duration of time I spent there. I was accompanied to these centers with the FT Education Program Coordinator (EPC) responsible for overseeing the center. During my observations, I had the opportunity to join students in small group work, chat with them before and after class, and during snack time. While this limited my access to the centers, it also gave me opportunities to ask questions about and debrief what I saw during my observations. The EPCs I worked with, particularly Yousef, the EPC of the Asma Center, were key participants in my research.

I came to my relationship with the HYC independently and by chance. The director of the center invited me to teach at the center and, in exchange, agreed to let me conduct research. I spent two full days a week at the HYC. The HYC was structured differently than the Rufayda and Asma Centers: Classes ran from 9:30-12:00 for girls and 2:00-4:00 for boys. The days I spent at the HYC, I observed in classes for both girls and boys and also taught English to both boys and girls. I also spent time on the bus with the

students to and from the center and before and after classes. Additionally, between 12:00-2:00, I spent time with the teachers, who ate lunch and conducted administrative work. (See Figure 1 below for a summary of my participant/observations)

In addition to participant/observations at the three centers, I built relationships with a few of the HYC students and spent some time with them outside of the HYC. Three Syrian students, Dana, Ghofran, and Rasha, lived in an apartment complex for Syrian refugees called the Hope House. I visited them there twice. I also became close with a Jordanian student, Jenan, and her mother. I visited them on numerous occasions at their home, they came to my home, and we took a day-long excursion together to a site of Roman ruins. I also visited with Amina, an Iraqi refugee, in her neighborhood where we talked in a park and then went shopping.

Beyond my observations in FT, I had opportunities to observe several spaces of inclusive refugee education as a volunteer:

- From September through December, 2016 I volunteered as a counselor in an afterschool program for Jordanian and Syrian refugee children;
- From January through April, 2017, I volunteered as an intern for an Educational Support Services program that provided supplementary education to Jordanian and refugee children. As an intern, I reviewed data and wrote reports. I also visited and observed their educational programs
- From April through June, 2017, I volunteered as a teacher at an organization that offered health services to refugees. I taught an English class to refugee youth and adults for this organization

- From April through August, 2017, I volunteered with an organization that ran sports activities for Jordanian and refugee children and youth

Additionally, I spent a few weeks volunteering as an English teacher in a public school in the Badia, a rural area outside of Amman. Although there were no Syrians in the school and only a few refugees from other countries, this experience gave me a brief glimpse into what a public school in Jordan looked like.

I also participated in other activities related to refugee education broadly, primarily from a policy perspective. I attended two Education Sector Working Group meetings, a conference hosted by No Lost Generation, a conference hosted by the British Council, and a training hosted by the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. These events helped shape my understanding of the policy and practice context in which I was working.

Through all of these participant/observations, I took notes during my observations as best I could. I tried to have a notebook out at all times in order to be transparent about my role as a researcher. When it was not possible to have a notebook out (for example,

Figure 1: Participant/Observations in FT			
Location	Timeline	Details	Other
FT Headquarters	September through December, 2016	Sporadically	
HYC	January through April, 2017	8 hours, 2 days a week -as a teacher and observer	-Time with 3 Syrian students at Hope House -Time with 1 Jordanian student -Time with 1 Iraqi student -Virtual communication (Whatsapp, Facebook)
Rufayda Center	January through April, 2017 -just observation	2 hours, 1 day a week -as an observer	Commute with EPC
Asma Center	May through July, 2017	2 hours, 1 day a week -as an observer	Commute with EPC

Figure 1: Participant/Observations in FT

during morning arrival at the HYC when students and teachers were in the courtyard), I took down notes as soon as I could. I then expanded these jottings to detailed field notes where I also included personal reflections and analysis about what I saw.

Enquiring: Conducting Interviews

While participant observations may be considered a more "passive" form of inquiry, interviews involve "intruding" more actively into the lives of research participants through direct questioning and conversation (Wolcott, 2009, p. 49). Wolcott and Bernard (2006) distinguish between forms of interview types, some more invasive than others. My research entailed two types of interviews: informal interviews, defined as

"hanging out and talking informally" (Bernard, 2006, p. 211) and semi-structured interviews, which use an interview guide to loosely direct the conversation.

I conducted 22 interviews with 40 FT students across five FT centers. Students from the three centers where I conducted interviews were my primary source of data and provided much richer and more detailed interviews. Interviews with students at the other two centers were valuable in expanding my sample and providing additional context. Most of the interviews were conducted in groups of two or three which I found helped students feel more comfortable and talk more freely. Student interviews included 17 Jordanian students, 21 Syrian students, one Egyptian student and one Iraqi student. I conducted all interviews in Arabic and recorded them. It is important to note that, quite unfortunately, I was unable to conduct formal, semi-structured interviews with the three primary Syrian research participants at the HYC. One student returned to Syria, one got

married and was not permitted to participate in an interview, and I lost contact with the third. I have provided an overview of the interviews in Figure 2.

Figure 2: FT Student Interviews		
Center	Citizenship status	Number interviewed
HYC	Syrian refugee	4
	Jordanian citizen	5
	Other (non-citizen)	1
Rufayda Center	Syrian refugee	1
	Jordanian citizen	6
	Other (non-citizen)	0
Asma Center	Syrian refugee	2
	Jordanian citizen	3
	Other (non-citizen)	1
Other Centers	Syrian refugee	14
	Jordanian citizen	3
	Other (non-citizen)	0

Figure 2: FT Student Interviews

I also held interviews with 11 teachers across the five centers and the director of education at the HYC. The HYC interviews included the level one teacher and two level two teachers. In the other centers, the structure of teachers was different and not divided by level but, rather, by subject matter. In those centers, I interviewed four Arabic teachers, three math and science teachers and one English teacher. See Figure 3 for an overview of teacher interviews.

Figure 3: FT Teacher Interviews		
	Number of teachers	Subject and Number
HYC	3, 1 administrator	Level 1 (1) and Level 2 (2)
Rufayda Center	2	English (1) and Arabic (1)
Asma Center	2	Arabic (1) and Math/Science (1)
Other Centers	4	Arabic (2) and Math/Science (2)

Figure 3: FT Teacher Interviews

I conducted semi-structured interviews with FT actors as well as refugee education actors outside of FT. Within FT HQ, I conducted formal, semi-structured interviews with seven administrators and, as I mentioned above, held informal interviews with four Education Program Coordinators and ongoing conversations with other FT staff. The interviews with FT HQ staff varied in language (some in Arabic, some in English) and in documentation method (some were recorded and some I took notes by

Figure 4: Interviews with FT Headquarters Administrators			
Position	Language	Documentation	Number of interviews
Education administrator	English	Notes by hand	2
Monitoring and evaluation	English	Notes by hand	1
Program/project manager	Arabic	Recorded and transcribed	3
Program/project manager	Arabic	Recorded and transcribed	1
Quality assurance	English	Notes by hand	2
Quality assurance	Arabic	Recorded and transcribed	1
Director	English	Recorded and transcribed	1

Figure 4: Interviews with FT Headquarters Administrators

hand). I also interviewed some administrators multiple times. This information is summarized in Figure 4.

I translated and transcribed Arabic interviews together with my translator, Ahmad. Ahmad and I listened to the interviews together, translated them together, and I transcribed them. This process was an opportunity for me get clarification on certain words or phrases I did not understand. Ahmad's role as a translator really expanded beyond simple linguistic translation; he was indispensable in illuminating the cultural and contextual elements of the interviews and helping me to understand the full nature of what people said in my interviews. I discuss later in the chapter my decisions around how I worked with the translator.

In addition to my interviews with FT students, teachers, and administrators, I also conducted 24 so called elite interviews with refugee education actors working at a range of institutions including UN agencies, donor agencies, Jordanian government agencies, and non-governmental organizations. These interviews provided insight into the broad constellation of refugee education in regionally and locally, offered insider perspective on refugee-related policy, and helped me understand the context and tone of my research (Richards, 1996).

Examining: Document Analysis

In addition to experiencing and enquiring, I also engaged in examination. Wolcott (2008) notes that examination may include documents such as policies, as well as "anything that informants may have in personal possession that might be shared with the ethnographer" (p. 50). For my purposes, this element of the research focused primarily on refugee education policies at the global, regional, and local level, including: the UNHCR

Global Education Strategy (2012); several iterations of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan, the regional response plans (United Nations 2014, 2015, 2016); the Jordan Response Plan to the Syria Crisis (MOPIC, 2015, 2016, 2017); and earlier Jordanian national policies such as the National Response Plan (MOPIC, 2014). In addition to policies, I reviewed FT documents including two textbooks, two of which serve as central data in Chapter Six.

My primary task in reviewing these documents was two-fold. First, I look at how they shaped ideas and structures of refugee education, broadly speaking. Second, I looked in particular at how they talked about the integration of refugees into educational systems and programs, with particular attention to "inclusive education."

Timeline of the Study

Overall, this was a year-long ethnographic study which I conducted from September 2016 through August 2017 in Jordan. I spent the first four months of the study, from September through December, improving my Arabic and getting to know the lay of the land. I did this by conducting the majority of my elite interviews and document review, asking questions, and talking to people about the refugee situation in Jordan. This yielded a strong background in the local context for inclusive refugee education. From January through July, I conducted participant observations in the three research sites. I was at the HYC and the Rufayda Center from January through April and the Asma Center from May through June.

Analysis

Analysis of data was an ongoing, inductive process focused both on looking at patterns and themes across the data along with unique stories that complicated the generalities. Overall, this study was interested in generating description and interpretation of inclusive refugee education but, moreover, thinking about the processes and practices within the classrooms and centers and how they contribute to or hinder a sense of broad inclusion. I engaged in two approaches to analysis, analyzing ethnographically and analyzing narratively.

Throughout the research process, I engaged in what Richardson and St. Pierre (2005) have called "writing as a method of inquiry," that is, using the writing process as a way to think through the data I have generated. This entailed writing descriptive and reflective memos based on my research experiences along with journaling. The memos provided a space to write what I was seeing and how I was thinking about it analytically. I continued to analyze my data through the writing of the data chapters themselves. Through the process of structuring the chapters, writing out the data, honing my arguments, receiving feedback from colleagues, and revising my work, I continued to analyze and strengthen my analysis.

Analyzing Ethnographically

In order to structurally and methodically analyze my data, I first read through all of, focusing on my student and teacher interviews and field notes. After sorting through hundreds of pages of text, I began engaging in a formal coding process. Like Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2014), I consider coding itself part of the analysis as I generate themes and organize data into "code clumps" (Glesne, 1999 as cited by Madison, 2005, p.

36). Using atlas.ti, I first chunked my data into broad themes that emerged through my reading and through my research. Some of these themes revolved around my interview questions. For example, I asked all students to describe a "good school" and a "bad school." As a result, I created a broad code for "good school" and "bad school." I also had codes that were more broadly thematic, such as gender roles and aspirations. Then, I went through each of my coded chunks and engaged in pattern coding, grouping the first cycle of codes into smaller number of categories, themes and constructs (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014).

As I sorted through the data, I focused on the practices of inclusive refugee education and how students and teachers interacted with and spoke about them. It was through this process that I identified the broad themes of my data chapters. While there has, of course, been some modification in the chapter layout over the nearly two years I spent analyzing and writing my dissertation, the broad themes of student interaction (Chapter Five), engagement with curriculum (Chapter Six), and teaching practices (Chapter Seven) have remained fairly constant.

Throughout the analysis and writing process, I periodically returned to my raw data to look at the coded elements as part of a broader whole. This helped to keep my data in its context and enabled me to look at it through fresh eyes.

Analyzing Narratively

In addition to the traditional analysis process described above, I also engaged in what Polkinghorne (1995) terms "narrative analysis." This form of analysis emerged naturally as I began to write the data chapters of my dissertation. I realized that writing thematically alone did not capture the humanity of my research participants. I was not

comfortable distilling a year of engagement and relationships building with human beings as simple data points in an analysis. I wanted to "exhibit [their] human activity as purposeful engagement in the world" and felt it was important to "display [their] human existence as situated action" in a particular time and place (Polkinghorne, p. 5). This felt particularly important for work with refugee youth, a population which often goes unheard or seen, blended into a generalized, "unidentified and decontextualized" (Gatrell, 2013, p. 10) refugee whole, assumed to exist within a "single, essential, transhistorical refugee condition" (Malkki, 1995, p. 511). Thus I began composing narratives to express the themes and ideas captured in my data.

I engaged in narrative analysis, a procedure whereby I composed narrative based on my data. While some of the data was already in storied form, I wove other data together from interviews and my field notes to construct an "emplotted narrative" (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 15). These narratives help to "preserve the complexity of human action with its interrelationship of temporal sequence, human motivation, chance happenings, and changing interpersonal and environmental contexts" (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 7). If story telling is a way that individuals make meaning of their lives, as numerous scholars have asserted (Bruner, 1986; Casey, 1996; McAdams, 1993), it follows that representing data in the form of stories enables readers to understand and relate to the experiences of the characters.

Hopkins (2009) argues that narrative can be a particularly useful approach to research with refugees. She argues that highlighting the stories of specific individual refugees humanizes and individualizes the subject in an era when refugees live in the public imagination "*en masse*, but out of sight, without individual identities" (p. 136).

Furthermore, sharing the stories of refugees can provide insight into the ways that particular policies play out at the ground level and how they impact the lives of the beneficiaries. Additionally, using narrative can be a political tool to bring individual's stories to the fore, in a way that can "disrupt and disturb [dominant] discourse by exposing the complexities and contradictions that exist under official history" (Denzin, 2008 as cited by Hopkins, 2009, p. 137). In this vein, I aimed to heed Sparkes's (1994) warning that researchers must move "beyond paternalistic notions of 'giving voice" and, instead, embrace life history "as an expression of solidarity with those who share their stories in the hope of creating individual and societal change" (p. 180).

My use of narrative analysis was not all encompassing. As will be clear in reading the data chapters, they are not entirely comprised of stories. Rather, I follow a hybrid approach in the same vein as Wangsness-Willemsen (2016) that employs stories, but also ties those stories to broader themes drawn from my data, thus bringing together ethnographic analysis and narrative analysis.

Ethical Dilemmas and Practical Challenges in the Field

All researchers confront ethical dilemmas during their fieldwork and in writing up their research. While some ethical considerations were addressed in writing through the Internal Review Board approval process, many ethical dilemmas I faced were, according to Ryen (2011) "emergent and contextual and call[ed] for situational responses" (as cited by Hett & Hett, 2013, p. 496). The instance of ethical dilemmas and practical challenges in the context of humanitarian crises and highly charged political environments are even more so. Moreover, the risks of conducting research in these climates are high for both

the researcher and research participants (King, 2009; Clark, 2006). As such, it is relevant to lay out here some of the ethical and practical challenges I faced and how they were addressed. As will be apparent in this section, the practical and ethical challenges are greatly intertwined and, thus, I will not distinguish them in that way. Rather, I will follow Hett and Hett's (2013) categorization of 'ethics of gaining access' and 'ethics of having access'.

Ethics and Challenges of Gaining Access

I obtained a certain level of preliminary access to FT through my connection with the director of the organization, Conrad (not his real name). He sponsored my Fulbright application and invited me to come research the FT program. Throughout my fieldwork and continuing until today, he has been a generous source of support and encouragement.

While the FT Director opened the door, I was still reliant on other members of the FT staff to let me in. That is, despite Conrad's support, there were numerous other gatekeepers who created hurdles for me to jump and, ultimately, restricted my access to FT. In retrospect, perhaps this should not have been surprising. As Hererra (2010) notes, physical access to research in the Middle East is only the first step. In a preliminary conversation with FT education staff when I first arrived in Jordan, I explained that Conrad and I had agreed upon regular observations and interviews, and was welcomed by the staff. Yet, several months later when it was time to begin this part of the research, they suddenly sang a different tune. What resulted was an agreement of weekly visits, escorted by an Education Program Coordinator and a directive that I needed permission from the MoE to conduct interviews with students and teachers. The MoE denied my

interview request twice and in July, FT made alternative arrangements that enabled me to interview students and teachers.

None of this is too surprising, given the literature around conducting research in the Middle East. In a survey of political scientists who work in the Middle East conducted by Clark (2006), 45 percent of respondents indicated that the majority of challenges faced in field research stem from the authoritarian political climate. Among these challenges is a general suspicion of researchers which often results in "mistrust and nervousness in speaking frankly to researchers for fear of political repercussions" (Clark, 2006, p. 418). Radsch (2009), Norman (2009), Hett and Hett (2013) and Hererra (2010) all point to a general sentiment in the Middle East region that Western scholars could be spies, leading to greater mistrust and reluctance to talk. Conducting research in (post) conflict zones or refugee situations, frequently characterized as highly political contexts, is also likely to raise suspicions and draw scrutiny from the refugee population, the government and non-governmental organizations (Norman, 2009; Schmidt, 2007).

When I realized that I would have limited access to FT centers, I set out to identify another research site where I might have greater access. I eventually found the HYC, a community center that ran educational programming for Jordanian and Syrian refugee youth. When I met with the Director, Aya, I learned that this community center actually worked in partnership with FT to run an NFE program. Thus, with Aya's invitation, I was able to conduct more extensive research in the NFE program. I loved spending my days at the HYC and built strong relationships with many of the students, teachers, and administrators. However, I was unaware of some of the internal dynamics of the center and an underlying tension between the Director of the HYC, Aya, and the

Director of Education, Yazar. Yazar served as a link between the HYC, FT, and the MoE and was a strong supporter of my research. Yet, there were difficulties between Yazar and Aya, that, unfortunately, affected me. After four months of volunteering and researching at the HYC, Aya asked me to stop coming and, soon afterwards, in a scandalous incident, she fired Yazar. Prior to this, Yazar worked with the administration to arrange for me to conduct a few interviews with HYC students and teachers. Unfortunately, my time was restricted and I was only able to interview a few. Fortunately, I had relationships with some of the students outside the center and, in the case of two students, their parents allowed me to conduct interviews in their homes.

Ethics and Challenges of Having Access

Ethical and practical decisions did not end once I obtained access to the centers. It was vital to engage in ongoing relationship building and trust building; there were also ethical issues of power that play out in the research relationship and issues of security and protection.

Norman (2009) highlights the importance of building trust to overcome some of the suspicion and skepticism researchers face in conflict zones. I strived to build this trust with my participants during the time I spent in FT and feel I achieved this trust to varying degrees with different participants. I built trust in numerous ways. First, I was transparent about my research goals and objectives, obtained informed consent, and explained procedures to protect anonymity and confidentiality (Norman, 2009). Norman notes that this sort of cognitive trust may not be sufficient, particularly in conflict zones, where agreements, laws, and rules are frequently violated or abused. She asserts that personal and social bonds can cultivate emotional trust. I strived to do so by spending time with

teachers and students and building relationships with them. I feel I was particularly successful in building emotional trust with teachers and students at the HYC, where I taught classes and visited with students outside the classroom.

Researchers play an essential role in shaping encounters with research participants, and a key element of that role traditionally is an unequal power relationship (Luttrell, 2000, p. 499). That is, researchers wield significant power over research participants in ways that interviews are set up through unidirectional and authoritative questioning. Additionally, researchers exert power when they choose what they report on and how they represent their research participants. The transparency that I exhibited in my research and my efforts to engage participants in my research by directly sharing with them what I was seeing—especially at the HYC--was an attempt to dismantle the power relationship, to an extent. My limited time at the other FT centers restricted my ability to engage too much with teachers and students, I maintained aware of these dynamics and approached my interactions with teachers and students with them in mind.

Tied to notions of power is the responsibility of the researcher to attend to the safety and security of her research participants and herself. Following the cardinal rule of research (and humanitarian aid) of do no harm (Herrera, 2010; Madison, 2005), it was incumbent upon me as a researcher to protect my participants. This was especially important given my work with Syrian refugees, whose rights are limited and few authorities are willing (or able) to protect them (Jacobsen & Landau, 2003). If Western researchers are frequently targets of government surveillance and suspicion, which am sure was the case for me, then it is possible for my research participants to similarly fall under surveillance and suspicion (Clark, 2006). My participants were protected largely

through the security measures put in place by FT in their centers, but I took extra precautions, especially when visiting refugees outside the centers. For example, in all my visits to students, I hired a trusted confidant who drove me to their homes. My driver, Ryad, understood the work I was doing and the need for discretion. As such, we varied transportation routes and he respected the privacy of my students and their families.

Issues of confidentiality (and anonymity) also played an important role in protecting my research participants—especially among vulnerable populations such as refugees. I recognized that I was not necessarily aware of internal politics or dynamics that could put a research participant at risk. Thus, I understood that maintaining research participant confidentiality was essential in highly politicized contexts where individuals can become stigmatized or targeted if certain information about them is revealed (Jacobsen & Landau, 2003). As Radsch (2009) and Parkinson (2014) suggest, I maintained all my data in password protected and encrypted files. Within the data itself as well as my writing, I used pseudonyms for all research participants. I also made it clear to my research participants that while I will do the best I can to protect their confidentiality, I cannot guarantee it completely. For the students, this became a game of sorts where I let them choose the pseudonyms that I would use. I was also cautious in the questions I asked and the information I elicited, avoiding topics that would be considered political or taboo (Parkinson, 2014). I remained conscious of my commitment to confidentiality and upheld it to the best of my ability.

Jacobsen and Landau (2003) also address challenges and ethical issues related to use of an interpreter or research assistant. They discuss the need for sensitivity regarding the origins and political, religious, and ethic affiliations of research participants and

translators, noting that using a research assistant from the same area as a research participant can "risk transgressing political, social or economic fault-lines which the researcher may not know of" (p. 193). Conversely, in a refugee situation, having a research assistant from the host country can also be intimidating for the research participant and change the dynamics of the research relationship. As I mentioned earlier, I worked with a translator, but did not bring him with me to interviews. I did so for three reasons. First, I was concerned about the way that gender dynamics would play out during my interviews, given that my translator, Ahmad, was a man. I worried that his presence in the interviews would intimidate my female research participants and impact what they were comfortable sharing during our interviews. Second, while I trusted Ahmad completely, I worried that the non-Jordanian students would be uncomfortable speaking openly about their experiences in Jordan. Third, given the challenges I faced with FT and the HYC in getting permission to do the interviews, I worried that adding any extraneous factors would provide additional challenges or result in restrictions to my interviews.

I would like to note here that Ahmad was indispensable to my research process. He had significant experience helping foreigners understand the cultural nuances of the Jordanian and Syrian dialects and experience working with Syrian refugees. He was also well educated and held progressive ideas about women, refugees, and other sensitive topics that allowed us to have meaningful and productive conversations about the experiences my students described in their interviews. The hours upon hours we spent translating and discussing interview data were monumental in helping me understand what students were experiencing and how processing what they said.

As this section has illuminated, I experienced numerous challenges in conducting my research. While, at times, these challenges felt overwhelming and I worried about the outcomes of my research, today I am proud of the work that I did and the ways that I navigated these challenges. Although I was caught within internal politics that impacted my access, I remained committed to protecting my research participants and composing a critical ethnography that would, hopefully, advocate for their educational needs. Throughout my research, I frequently returned to the words of Linda Herrera (2010), which I use here to close this section:

> A researcher must enter the field with humility in the knowledge of her own ignorance, with a spirit of respect, honesty and good will towards the community in which she is entering, and an understanding that her presence, questions, and intentions—good as they may be—may not be greeted with overwhelming enthusiasm. (p. 123)

Researcher Positionality

The ethical challenges I discussed above, along with the entire process of conducting and writing this research—including the ways that I have made sense of the data—is deeply intertwined with my own positionality. Similarly, the access I was given, the relationships I built, and the way I was able to understand the research context were shaped by the ways my participants saw and understood me.

It is first important to contextualize my relationship and engagement with the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region and with Jordan. My interest in the MENA region began as a freshman in college in 2001 on the backdrop of the attacks of

September 11th. I sought to learn about the region beyond the demonizing discourses I was hearing from the media and in an effort to engage with alternative narratives and understandings. My formal studies of the region and the Arabic language led me to study abroad in Cairo, to volunteer with Arab populations in Israel, and to serve as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Morocco. Through these experiences, I have tried to move past the common assumptions of Arabs and Muslims that circulate in the US and share these perspectives with my communities at home.

These formative experiences in the Middle East did *not* include Jordan and, in fact, this study was the first time I spent more than a vacation period in Jordan. Thus, I faced a learning curve in seeking to understand the context in which my research took place. I was supported by the Fulbright community and staff as well as knowledgeable Jordanian and Syrian tutors and friends who helped me make sense of what I was seeing and hearing. I also kept this awareness with me as I began my research. In the first few months, I focused on learning the Jordanian dialect of Arabic and taking things in, asking questions, and trying to understand.

I also tried to remain aware of the ways that I was perceived by my research participants and how that impacted the nature of our research relationship. In the beginning, it seemed that my identity as an outsider was intriguing to many of the FT students and even some of the teachers. They went out of their way to be kind and welcoming and, students in particular, enjoyed asking me questions about life in America. As the novelty of my presence wore off, what remained was a general disinterest from many, students and teachers, combined with reservation from some of the teachers. I came to understand that some teachers had concerns about my affiliation

with FT at the HQ level and worried that my research was, in some way, an evaluation of them that would affect their jobs. I approached by being transparent about my role as a researcher and explaining the purpose of my research multiple times, emphasizing that I was *not* interested in evaluating them. Given the skepticism I faced, I did not feel comfortable engaging teachers in critical reflection on their teaching practice; rather, I erred on the side of praise and encouragement. While I felt uncomfortable with this at times, particularly in my observations of inequities playing out in the classroom, I was even more uncomfortable at the prospect of engaging in conversations that would have been considered critical or controversial. While this was the case with FT teachers, I was more comfortable engaging in some of these conversations with FT staff at the HQ level and, particularly, the Director of FT who invited me to conduct the research.

While I had concerns about my Jewish identity going into my research, it became clear that very few Jordanians or Syrians I worked with identified me as Jewish. Many people never ever learned my last name, and those that did, still did not seem to make the connection. This was solidified for me by the number of people who assumed my religion to be Christianity and engaged me in conversation about it.

(De) limitations

This study attends to broad social and cultural structures that shape the experiences of inclusive refugee education at a micro-level in the classroom and in the school. This study gives limited attention to the role of economic and political structures in shaping those experiences. While these are important elements that certainly shape educational possibilities and experiences for refugee youth, they did not emerge as

central to my participants through my interviews and conversations. Thus, I have delimited the study to focus on social and cultural elements, which were much more salient for my research participants. Relatedly, this dissertation focuses on ideas of inclusion at a local and relational level without giving much attention to the connections between education, inclusion, and broader notions of citizenship and the state. As I discuss in the conclusion, this is a direction for future work but beyond the scope of this dissertation.

By situating this study in the context of FT centers, a relatively small organization that offers a unique approach to inclusive refugee education, it is my hope that I can shed light on some of the practices and experiences of inclusive refugee education. This work is not intended to be broadly generalizable to refugee education globally or even throughout Jordan; rather, I seek to illuminate the possibilities and limitations of this model of refugee education. In that regard, I hope this work can speak to policy makers, education practitioners, teachers, and students in considering ways forward for inclusive refugee education.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the critical ethnographic methodology, my research design, and the three primary methods I used to conduct my research. It explored my approach to data analysis through the lenses of ethnography and narrative and how I brought them together in this work. Finally, I discussed the ethical and practical challenges I faced in both gaining and having access and the ways those shaped

and were shaped by my positionality as a researcher. The following chapter offers greater insight into the contexts in which this research took place.

Chapter Four: Strands of Context: Framing the Study

In this chapter, I seek to frame this study in the multiple and overlapping contexts in which it took place. In order to understand the local processes and practices of inclusive refugee education in my three research sites, we must also consider the broader discursive, policy, and organizational context(s) which shape attitudes towards refugees and approaches to refugee education. That is, while my study was situated within three particular FT sites, these centers are part of a larger picture that is influenced by a range of cultural, social, political, and economic factors. These intertwined factors influence, give meaning to, and are made meaningful through the practice of inclusive refugee education. My understanding of context is influenced by Sobe and Kowalczyc (2012, 2014) who explicate the term by drawing on its Latin origin, *contextere*, meaning 'interweaving.' They explain that the "notion of interweaving allows us to focus on Contexts[9] as assemblages of multiple discourses, practices, techniques, objects, and propositions that come together in particular places at particular times" (2014, p. 11). Thus, this chapter represents a snapshot of a much wider, expansive, and ever changing context, mediated through my own methodological and epistemological perspective (Bartlett and Vavrus, 2019).

In this chapter, I argue that my FT three research sites are situated within an environment of tensions that frame the possibilities and limitations of inclusion in the context of inclusive refugee education. Attending to these various tensions, and the way

[9] Sobe and Kowalczyc (2014) distinguish between big 'C' Context, which they conceptualize as a set of historical Discourses that govern what is possible to think and do, and little 'c' context, which they describe as elements of a given setting.

they manifest and overlap, provides necessary context to understand the practices and processes of inclusive refugee education and how students and teachers made meaning of them. To support this argument, I analyze three strands of this context and the tensions within them. The first is the discursive context that largely frames attitudes and understandings of refugees in Jordan as one of both hospitality and resentment, where hospitality is conditioned by discourses of development and security to create resentment towards refugees (El-Abed, 2014). The second strand illuminates the policy context that shapes the structure of inclusive refugee education in Jordan, as one meant to both include refugees yet, simultaneously, prioritize Jordanian national development. The third strand narrows in on the organization of Forseh Tanieh and its philosophy and pedagogy. I illustrate the tension between its philosophical underpinnings of Freirean pedagogy meant to reveal and transform oppression and the reality of its pedagogical practices that more closely resemble student-centered learning and a reification of oppression. Taken together, these three strands of context, which all influence each other, create a web of tensions that both enable and constrain the practices, processes, and experiences of inclusive refugee education takes place.

I open my discussion of each strand of context with a short vignette from my research in order to illuminate some of the ways that these broad ideas influence local practice. It is important to note that this chapter represents a snapshot of a much wider, expansive, and ever changing context, mediated through my own methodological and epistemological perspective (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2019). In reading the three strands that I present here, one should not assume that they are independent of each other; rather, these three strands are deeply intertwined with each other, along with multiple other strands

that I have not included in the chapter.

Strand I: The Discursive Context

Rana and I sat in the back seat of the car on our way to a teacher training she was conducting for a local education organization that offered remedial education to Syrian refugees and Jordanian students. During our conversation, Rana told me about the "cultural differences" she saw between Syrians and Jordanians. According to Rana, Syrians did not value education the way that Jordanians did and, as a result, the Syrian parents did not support their children's learning like Jordanian parents did. This, she explained, is why Syrian students were struggling more in the remedial education program. She compassionately recognized that some Syrian refugees had other issues that took their attention away from education, like finding work, navigating the bureaucracy to get access to resources, or dealing with psychological trauma. Yet, she became exasperated while wondering how Syrian mothers could afford to buy makeup and fancy clothes, and not school books. She attributed this to the cultural differences between them, explaining that Syrians value their appearance while Jordanians value their education.

I asked if these cultural differences affected the ways that the Jordanian teachers treated the Syrian students or if it caused problems between the Syrian and Jordanian students. Rana responded:

No, no, not at all. We accept each other because we are all Arabs and we are all from the same culture. In this region, we are pretty much the same. We are all

Muslims and Arabs, and we speak the same language. Even though there might me some differences, we are all brothers[10], we are all the same.

With the insistence that Jordanians and Syrians were united in brotherhood, Rana changed the subject.

This short conversation with Rana introduces the idea of brotherhood and sameness among Jordanians and Syrians. While Rana used the concept of brotherhood to signal acceptance of Syrian refugees, her words indicate a conditionality of that acceptance, frequently undermined by prejudicial words and actions, like Rana's above. While she claimed that a shared Islamic and Arab identity made Jordanians and Syrians 'the same,' she also asserted that Syrians held different values regarding education, which limited their success. This example points to the conditionality of the notion of sameness and brotherhood in the context of education. Syrian refugees are viewed as the same, until they are not.

Hospitality and Resentment: Tensions of Refugee Hosting in Jordan

During the course of my field work, I repeatedly encountered contradictory attitudes towards Syrian refugees, as illustrated in the vignette above. On the one hand, Jordanians and Syrians frequently told me that "*kulna ikhwan*," we're all brothers. I heard this idea from taxi drivers, waiters, and coffee baristas. This notion emerged in discussions with my Jordanian and Syrian friends and colleagues, in class discussions with FT students, and during elite interviews with education actors including employees

[10] This is a translation from the Arabic word "*ikhwan*," which translates literally to 'brothers' but connotes both males and females. Throughout this dissertation, I use the literal translation of the word *ikhwan* in the phrase "we're all brothers" even in all female settings, like those of classrooms in which I researched.

of the UN, donor agencies, and international and local NGOs. The notion of sameness was asserted in the name of tolerance, hospitality, and acceptance of Syrian refugees in Jordan. Yet, I also frequently heard Jordanians express frustration with the presence of so many Syrian refugees in the country, accusing them of taking jobs, causing an increase in rental prices, and even blaming them for the increased traffic in major cities. Even people like Rana, who worked closely with Syrian refugees, accused Syrians of not caring enough about their children's education and questioned many of their choices.

As I reflected on this notion of brotherhood and sameness and the seemingly contradictory tensions I saw between Jordanians and Syrians, it echoed claims of colorblindness in the face of racial oppression the United States (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). By colorblindness, I refer to the idea commonly held by whites in America that racism no longer exists and that people should be treated simply as human beings, without attention to their race (Plaut, 2010). While this approach to colorblindness often comes from a place of good intention (Smith, Geroski & Tyler, 2014), it actually reinforces and reproduces systemic racial inequality by denying the reality of racism (Ferber, 2012). Similarly, I came to understand the concept of "we're all brothers" between Jordanians and Syrians as one of good intentions that ultimately served to mask the vulnerabilities of Syrian refugees in Jordan and reinforce the inequalities they face. This notion of difference-blindness was pervasive throughout my research and will be addressed in relation to teacher pedagogy in Chapter Seven

El-Abed's (2014) work on the discourse of guesthood in Jordan held explanatory power for me in understanding the seemingly contradictory tensions between "we're all brothers" on the one hand and the resentment that Jordanians expressed towards Syrians

on the other. She asserts that this tension is the enactment of three primary discourses employed by the GoJ and humanitarian agencies: the guest discourse, the development discourse, and the security discourse. El-Abed (2014) argues that through the guest discourse, the state claims an unconditional sense of hospitality towards refugees. Yet, drawing on the work of Brun (2010), she asserts that hospitality inherently "involves power and inequality in the relationship between the host and the guest," rendering it conditional (p. 84). The state's guest discourse is tempered by its interests in "security, politics, national identity, demographic [sic], and territory" leading to development and security discourses that limit hospitality and cultivate fear, distrust, and resentment towards refugees (p. 84).

According to El-Abed (2014), the guest discourse in Jordan rests on three cultural dimensions of Jordanian national identity: Bedouin, Islamic, and Arab.

> Jordan's 'Bedouin hospitality' materializes through the purported generous reception of 'guests.' This welcome is demonstrated through wordings that refer to the willingness to be the first to help and support the guest as a Bedouin virtue. Upon arrival in Jordan, forced migrants are addressed in the official discourse as 'guests', welcomed by the state, by the Jordanian people, and by individuals, 'who share the bread and dates," as King Abdullah of Jordan put it in his interview with CNN. (p. 84)

The second dimension of Jordan's hospitality discourse is rooted in the Islamic value of welcoming the stranger. El-Abed demonstrates how the late King Hussein drew on Islamic unity by connecting Jordan's hospitality towards Palestinian refugees to the "religiously significant migration of Prophet Mohammed and his supporters, *Al-*

Muhajirun (the emigrants) to Medina, and their reception there by the *al Ansar* of (supporters of Islam)" (p. 85).

The third dimension of Jordan's hospitality discourse is the notion of pan-Arabism, which "has been a Hashemite ambition since the Arab revolt in the early twentieth century" (p. 86). This has been embedded in Jordanian public policy by referring to displaced Arabs as Arab brethren to emphasize the shared Arab identity. The mantra of "we're all brothers" evokes these three cultural dimensions of Jordanian national identity, Bedouin, Islamic, and Arab; ideas of both religion and kinship are embedded in the notion of brotherhood. Yet, while the guest discourse in Jordan claims unconditional hospitality, hospitality is only unconditional in the abstract; when guests actually arrive, "conditions governing their stay materialize alongside them" (Shirazi, 2018, p. 98). Thus, in the case of Jordan, "we're all brothers" signals an unconditional hospitality that is simultaneously conditioned by the realities of their presence in Jordan.

According to El-Abed (2014), Jordanian hospitality towards refugees is conditioned through the development discourse and security discourse (El-Abed, 2014). The development discourse as understood by El-Abed (2014) asserts the burden of forced migrants on the state of Jordan and the need for increased financial resources to support the state's development agenda. The driving message is that refugees strain Jordan's economy and infrastructure and have slowed Jordan's achievement of its development goals. As a result, this discourse places refugees and citizens in competition with each other for resources and jobs, fostering anger and hostility towards refugees. As I discussed in Chapter One, this discourse is taken up in various policies, most notably the Jordan Compact agreement between Jordan and the EU. The Jordan Compact embraced

an effort to turn the "humanitarian crisis" of the Syrian refugee situation into a development opportunity (Barbalet, Hagen-Zanker, & Mansour-Ille, 2018; Lenner & Turner, 2018). This discourse is reflected in education policy towards Syrian refugees, as I show later in this chapter.

El Abed (2014) also points to a security discourse as a conditioning factor of hospitality in Jordan. She asserts that the security discourse in Jordan revolves around containing the threat of terrorism and preventing conflict in the region from penetrating Jordan's borders. Security efforts in Jordan also seek to prevent the spread of so-called radical Islamic ideology, using school reform as an avenue to reduce the spread of extremism and religious radicalization (Shirazi, 2012). Resulting from this security discourse is the imposition of strict measures at the border that restrict the entry of forced migrants It also serves to frame refugees as threats to the state and potential terrorists, thereby stigmatizing the refugee and raising general anxieties about the Other. Drawing on Collet and Bang (2014), I extend the notion of securitization beyond physical security to also account for the perceived threats to economic security that refugees in Jordan foster. The threat to economic security is seen through Jordanian fears that Syrian refugees have taken Jordanian jobs, increased unemployment among Jordanians, increased rental rates across the country, and led to greater financial insecurity in the country (Achilli, 2015; Al-Khatib & Lenner, 2015; Lenner & Turner, 2018). The threat to economic security overlaps with the threat to Jordanian development reflected in the development discourse discussed earlier and furthers the notion that refugees are a burden to the country. This discursive positioning also works to mitigate humanitarian efforts towards refugees and limits the extension of hospitality towards them.

The tension between the sense of brotherhood between Syrian refugees and Jordanians asserted by the guest discourse, and the notion that this same population poses a burden, shaped by the discourses of development and security, lay under the surface throughout my research. As I will show in later chapters, these tensions bubbled up in educational practices at FT, with the development discourse much more prevalent than the security discourse. I will show in subsequent chapters how brotherhood (or sisterhood as I will call it in future chapters, given the female gender of my research participants) both mediated a sense of belonging and was also conditioned in various ways. In the next section of this chapter, I turn to the policy context in Jordan. Through an analysis of three policies, I point to ways that policy shapes refugee education in ways that responds to the development discourse.

Strand II: The Policy Context

My colleague and I entered a large conference room for the ESWG meeting and we took our seats in comfortable swivel chairs around a shiny, large, wooden conference table. When the meeting began, the chair of the meeting (a UNICEF employee) asked everyone in the room to introduce themselves. The quick introductions revealed 30 development and aid workers representing an alphabet soup of acronyms, some of which I recognized as international NGOs and others were unfamiliar to me. Once we completed the introductions, the meeting chair launched into the agenda items. The chair gave an update on the development of the 2017 JRP, the leading policy for the refugee and resilience response in Jordan, which is updated annually. Organizations had already provided their budgets to the Ministry of Planning and International Coordination

(MOPIC) which oversees the JRP, but MOPIC requested that education providers increase funding for the "resiliency efforts" of the JRP and decrease funding for the "refugee efforts." To clarify, the objectives and indicators in the JRP are divided between resiliency, efforts targeted towards the development of Jordan, and refugee efforts, which support service provisions directly to refugees. MOPIC was asking that the EWSG, whose primary objective is to "ensure uninterrupted access to public education for displaced Syrians children across the country" (UNHCR, n.d.) to reduce the amount of funding allocated to the provision of education for Syrian refugees and to expand funding and programming for Jordanians. The meeting chair explained that representatives from UNICEF, as the lead of the ESWG, unilaterally shifted the budget around on behalf of the ESWG members to meet the MOPIC needs. The final budget included $108 million USD to development efforts and $52 million USD to refugee efforts.

In the car ride back to the office, I asked my colleague if her organization would actually be affected at all by the budgetary changes UNICEF alluded to. She shrugged her shoulders. It seemed that the updates from the meeting would have little impact on her organization's budget and their subsequent support for refugee education in Jordan.

This vignette provides a small sliver of insight into one way that "authorized policies" play out in practice (Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009, p. 768). By authorized policies, I mean policies that represent discourses of varying governing structures through "a set of statements of how things should or must be done" that are upheld by "enforcement mechanisms of government" (Levinson et al., p. 70). In this vignette, the JRP was the authorized policy whose original budget did not reflect the

interests of the government, which wanted greater emphasis on development, echoing the development discourse as described by El-Abed (2014). Thus, UNICEF, as the chair of the ESWG, liaised with MOPIC on behalf of all aid organizations to shift around the budget as desired by the government. The changes were presented at an ESWG coordination meeting as a done deal, not open to discussion. Yet, with a slight shrug of her shoulders, my colleague—the sole representative of her organization at the meeting—suggested a subtle resistance to the changes, demonstrating her ability to "appropriate" policy in varying ways (Sutton & Levinson, 2001). Her shoulder shrug indicated to me that despite the changes to the proposed budget that UNICEF and MOPIC made, her organization would likely continue emphasizing refugee education rather than Jordanian development efforts.

In this section, I overview three "authorized policies" related to refugee education. I introduce UNHCR's GES, its global refugee education, the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP), a regional framework that responds to the Syria refugee situation, and the JRP, the Jordanian national response to the Syrian refugee crisis in Jordan. I provide an overview of these policies, their underlying ideologies, and the ways they frame inclusive refugee education in order to set the stage for Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, which will illuminate the practice of refugee education through one organization working in Jordan. Through my analysis, I also point to the presence of the development discourse in these policies and how they impact the direction of inclusive refugee education.

A few notes about this policy context section. First, these three policies are not the only policies contributing to the formation of refugee education in Jordan. However, they

emerged during my research as the most prominent in my conversations with policy makers and education development practitioners. Second, some of these three policies have been updated since I conducted my research in 2016-2017. In this section, I focus on the policies as they existed during my fieldwork as that is what framed the policy context at that time.

UNHCR Global Education Strategy: "Integration of Refugee Learners within National Systems"

As I discussed in Chapter One, the UNHCR Global Education Strategy (2012) introduced a new paradigm of refugee education, focusing on the integration of refugee learners into national education systems. The approach is described as follows:

> The general approach is *integration of refugee learners within national systems* where possible and appropriate and as guided by ongoing consultation with refugees. This approach provides a protective environment for refugee children and young people within the community and supports a focus on quality within existing systems of teacher training, learning assessments, and certification. (p. 8, emphasis added)

The Global Education Strategy posits that the inclusion of refugees into national systems will increase access to education, offer greater protection to refugee children and will allow for a focus on quality education not only for refugees, but for the entire education system in the host country.

Integration as a mechanism for access can be seen in the three way. First, the strategy calls for "constructing schools within host communities where possible and appropriate…to ensure access for both refugee and local community children" (p. 16).

Second, in order to reduce barriers of access to secondary schooling for refugees, the strategy encourages "supporting the cost of secondary school for refugees, preferably and where possible through partnerships with national Ministries of Education that allow for integration within national systems" (p. 19). Third, indicators around access to primary schooling and access to reading materials measures access in comparison to "national norms" (p. 13). This means that refugee children should have the same level of access as national students. These three approaches focus on the technical ways to get refugees into schools, but do not account for what happens within those schools. While there is certainly a need to get refugee children into schools, this approach to extending education access to refugees by supporting national schools in Jordan is justified and justifies the development discourse discussed above (El-Abed, 2014), making room to focus on Jordanian educational needs. This raises questions about quality and appropriateness of education for refugees. Indeed, Allaf and Washington (2013) argued in their study of education for Iraqi refugees that the integration of Iraqis into the public school system resulted in educational provisions that were not appropriate for the refugee population and did not adequately serve their needs.

In order to advance goals of quality education, the strategy emphasizes the training of teachers with a focus on national teachers and training systems. The Global Education Strategy states that the quality of education rests on teachers "more than any other single factor" and, as a result, places strong emphasis on teacher training. The strategy calls for extensive teacher training "drawing on and augmenting existing expertise within national systems, local teacher training institutes, and NGOs" (p. 15). That is, national training programs and training programs provided by local and

international NGOs should play a leading role in preparing national teachers for providing refugee education. However, there is limited emphasis on the content of the training in relation to integration other than mention of 'inclusive education,' which remains undefined throughout the GES. Additional clarity on what inclusive education is or could entail would help strengthen these trainings to ensure that they equip teachers with relevant skills to provide high quality education for refugees. While the Global Education Strategy was written in a way that would allow local priorities and conceptions of education to drive implementation (Dryden-Peterson et al., under review), Mendenhall et al. (2015) urge that quality education for refugees includes training on specific topics, including student-centered pedagogies, second- and third- language acquisition, and managing multilingual classrooms.

Partnerships with the MoE is another way that the strategy encourages the integration of refugee education into national systems. The Global Education Strategy places priority on building in-country partnerships, with an expected result of "100% of Country Programmes maintain a strong working partnership with the Ministry of Education at national and local level" (p. 31). Integration is reinforced as follows:

> In many situations, the integration of refugee learners within national systems may be the optimal approach to ensuring quality and protective education. Refugee children attend public schools where UNHCR provides support to improve education systems and learning conditions for both refugee and host community children. Refugee and host communities alike benefit from established education systems that include on-going efforts to improve teachers' skills and to assess and strengthen learning. Mainstreaming in national systems is

> particularly applicable in rural and urban settings, but it is also appropriate in many camp scenarios. (p. 31)

The emphasis on UNHCR support to education systems to strengthen education for "both refugee and host community children" alongside the development discourse discussed above leaves room for prioritizing the national system in a way that may not adequately account for refugees in the system.

While the Global Education Strategy makes some allusions towards relational integration that would cultivate a sense of connection or belonging, the primary focus is on structural integration, the "ability to access institutions and services, such as education" (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018, p. 10). Adelman (2018) argues that the strategy puts forth the concept of integration as a mechanism for ensuring its goals of access to and quality of education for refugees, rather than any broader sense of relational integration. There are slight references to relational integration such as the call for the "implementation of strategies aimed at creating socially and academically inclusive environments for refugee learners in national schools that support their integration and retention in school" (p. 32). Yet by and large, the Global Education Strategy outlines an approach of structural integration to ensure that refugees have access to high quality education.

The Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan: "The Pathway to Social Cohesion"

The UNHCR and UNDP, in collaboration with over 200 stakeholders across the region, lead the 3RP, a coordinated effort to support Syrian refugees and the communities that host them (UNDP & UNHCR, 2017). The 3RP is a regional framework which supports nationally-led plans that respond to the Syrian refugee situation in five

countries: Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey. Under the 3RP, each country develops its own strategy, which is brought together under the 3RP. The first 3RP was developed in 2015 and has been renewed annually.

There are four noteworthy aspects of the 3RP in relation to inclusive education in Jordan. First, the 3RP introduced a region-wide strategic shift from a solely humanitarian response to an integrated relief and development response that supports and protects all vulnerable populations, refugees and host country nationals. The approach is described as follows:

> The 3RP adopts an innovative, integrated approach that combines protection and humanitarian relief efforts with more focus on supporting national plans and development interventions to build resilience among individuals, communities and institutions across sectors. (3RP, 2015, p. 8)

Thus the 3RP includes two interlaced components in each sectoral plan, one focused on refugee protection and humanitarian aid and the other revolving around the resilience and development of the host country. In this way, the framework aims to protect refugees while also upholding and continuing each country's own development. Through this lens, integrating Syrian refugees into the national education system allows the Jordanian government to support the education of Syrian refugees as a humanitarian response while furthering its educational development initiatives. As indicated in the vignette above, this division between resilience and refugee support is embedded in the JRP, Jordan's component of the 3RP, and enables the GoJ to prioritize the resilience component of their response.

The second, and related, aspect of the 3RP is the move to empower national governments and place national ownership at the center of the response planning. The 3RP (UNDP & UNHCR, 2017) asserts:

> [The 3RP] is founded on the principle of *national ownership and leadership* of the response in each country. It emphasizes that international assistance should seek to strengthen and make effective use of in-country capacities and avoid the creation of parallel systems. Such leadership should be fostered at the national, sub-national and local levels. (p. 11, emphasis added)

Through the lens of national ownership, then, both relief and development responses should aim to support the host country by focusing on national systems, building local capacity, and avoiding the creation of parallel systems. The 3RP encourages host countries to align their response strategies with other national frameworks, such that their response can contribute to their own development, too. By giving countries ownership of the response plans, they are able to strengthen their own national systems in the name of supporting refugees. Thus, the principle of national ownership combined with a consolidated relief and development process justifies 'inclusive education,' whereby the GoJ can improve its education system to support both refugees and 'vulnerable populations' in the host country.

The third element of the 3RP which informs and justifies Jordan's inclusive education policy is social cohesion. Social cohesion was established as a cross-cutting theme in the 2015 3RP. Social cohesion is described as an approach to ease growing tensions between refugee and local populations, which has resulted from:

> an increase in competition for scarce resources, housing, and employment opportunities and a decline in the standard of living… Perceptions of host communities and stereotyping may also contribute to distrust and conflict. (UNDP & UNHCR, 2015, p. 20)

Later versions of the 3RP point to the need to "safeguard social cohesion to foster resilience and cooperation" (UNDP & UNHCR, 2016, p. 18) by increasing youth participation and "changing the focus on refugees as assets for host communities as opposed to burdens" (p. 18).

Social cohesion emerged as a key priority in refugee education among policy makers, education providers, and teachers and students in Jordan. I heard frequently in my interviews and conversations with national and international education providers that social cohesion was an essential goal of education programming in Jordan. One NGO representative told me that the notion of social cohesion is always "in the back of their mind" as they design and implement inclusive educational programs and train teachers (interview, May 8, 2017). To build social cohesion, education providers including those working for UN agencies as well as national and international NGOs, emphasized the importance of bringing Syrian refugees and Jordanians together so they can learn about each other and develop relationships with each other. While some education stakeholders noted the necessity of Jordanians and Syrians to learn about each other, many invoked notions of brotherhood as underlying the possibility for social cohesion. One NGO representative claimed that "there is not much different between our cultures because we are all Arabs and in this region, we are all really the same" (interview, March 19, 2017). A Jordanian student similarly evoked the notion of brotherhood and expanded it into an

obligation of hospitality. She explained that Syrians "are like our brothers….coming together with Syrians is our duty, for all Jordanians, because the Syrians are guests here in Jordan" (interview, July 31, 2017). And yet the practice of hospitality is conditioned by material realities on the ground and, as I illustrated above, shaped by the development and security discourses which position refugees as threats to Jordanian security and economic development. This often results in a sense of hostility towards refugees that contradicts the intentions of hospitality and welcome.

The fourth element of the 3RP which is relevant to Jordan's approach to inclusive education and further emphasizes education for social cohesion is its alignment with the No Lost Generation initiative, an innovative movement established by UNICEF in 2013 that supports and advocates for children and youth from Syria and the host communities. The 3RP draws on the No Lost Generation initiative to call for increased quality and access to education along with "strengthening education systems at national and sub-national levels" (UNDP & UNHCR, 2015, p. 35). The 3RP also builds on No Lost Generation in calling for increased life skills and citizenship education as "a means of preventing violence and bullying among children, [and] fostering social cohesion" (UNHCR & UNDP, 2016, p. 35). The No Lost Generation framework also rests on social cohesion as a core component and calls for citizenship education (despite there being no pathway to citizenship) and life skills "as the pathway to social cohesion by promoting values of active tolerance, peaceful coexistence, participation and solidarity" (No Lost Generation, 2016, p. 7).

Thus, the 3RP as a regional framework reinforces the notion of structural integration outlined in the Global Education Strategy and also expands an emphasis on

social cohesion through inclusion. In practice, the potential for social cohesion is reinforced by the notion of brotherhood the guest discourse present in Jordan. Yet, as I discussed, the guest discourse is conditioned by development needs which allows the Government of Jordan to prioritize the strengthening of national education systems.

The Jordan Response Plan: "Sustained Access to Quality and Inclusive Education"

As I introduced in Chapter One, the JRP is the leading policy in Jordan that shapes the response to the Syrian refugee situation. The JRP is a three year rolling plan developed by the GoJ, led by MOPIC, in collaboration with Ministries and comprehensive task forces for each sector. The plan "integrates refugee and resilience responses into one single plan for each sector and places the resilience of national systems and institutions at the core of the response" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 9). That is, it links humanitarian responses to the 'Syrian refugee crisis' with national and international development efforts to simultaneously support Syrian refugees and Jordanian people, communities, and institutions by strengthening national systems.

Jordan's educational response to the Syrian refugee situation is driven by the Jordanian MoE, with support from an education task force made up of education donors, UN agencies, and the ESWG (representing the NGO contingency) (field notes, August 10, 2017). The overall objective of the education sector strategy is to "ensure quality educational services for children and youth impacted by the Syria crisis" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 44). That is, the chief goal of the response to the influx of refugees seeks to ensure quality education for all children—Syrian and Jordanian—who are impacted by the refugee situation.

The situation analysis of the education sector response plan presented in the 2016-2018 JRP strategy states that:

> Jordan is committed to ensuring access to education to all Syrian refugee children, but requires strategic support to safeguard the progress achieved under the Education Reform for a Knowledge Economy (ERfKE) process. (MOPIC, 2016, p. 42)

That is, the GoJ will make strides to provide Syrian refugees access to quality education while ensuring that Jordan's educational development initiative, ERfKE, is not impacted. Thus, the sector strategy centers around the Jordanian school system. As I have shown above, this approach is supported by the Global Education Strategy and the 3RP and allows the GoJ to leverage international funds to support its education system.

The education strategy revolves around three pillars: government capacity building; quality inclusive education for all children affected by the crisis; access to inclusive education opportunities (MOPIC, 2016). These pillars align with the three objectives of the strategy:

> Specific Objective 1: Improved capacities of education authorities to plan for and manage the impact of the crisis on the education system
>
> Specific Objective 2: Improved provision of education services to sustain access to adequate, safe and protective learning spaces (quality); and
>
> Specific Objective 3: Increased provision of adequate, protective and safe learning spaces and facilities (access). (p. 44)

The education plan addresses formal (public) education, non-formal education (such as the FT program), and informal education (which, in Jordan, refers to non-certified

learning programs[11]); education at all levels, primary, secondary, and higher education; education in camps and in host communities.

Included in increasing government capacity is strengthening the capacity of the MoE to "absorb all boys and girls eligible for formal education" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 43). According to the JRP, capacity building will also contribute to the MoE's preparedness policy for future emergencies. A sub-objective of this first element of the plan is to "increase advocacy, resource planning and management capacity of MOE to absorb *all children eligible for official education*" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 45, emphasis added), emphasizing the MoE's commitment to enrolling Syrian refugees in the formal education system. This also provides a basis for improving and investing in the national education sector in Jordan.

In relation to quality education, the strategy identifies the need to train public school teachers to better serve refugee students and national students. It particularly mentions professional development to help teachers address the needs of "students affected by violence in Syria" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 43). The plan addresses training public school teachers in the national education system and indicators specify training in the ability to "respond to education in emergencies and ensure quality education" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 54). Much like in the GES, this is a very general outline for training that leaves 'quality' open to interpretation.

The JRP (MOPIC, 2016) identifies the need to ensure all children have access to education and a need to expand school infrastructure through construction of new schools

[11] During my fieldwork, the ESWG changed the terminology from informal education to learning support services and standardized its provision.

and rehabilitation of existing schools. Both of these needs demonstrate a goal of structurally integrating refugees into national education systems. This is reinforced by one indicator that will track "# Of school aged Syrian boys and girls enrolled in Jordanian public schools (primary and secondary)" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 49). In describing the objective of increasing access to "adequate, protective and safe learning" facilities, the JRP (MOPIC, 2016) explains that "the public education system is over-stretched. Double shifting and overcrowded schools are affecting quality and derailing on-going MoE reforms" (p. 44). This is used as justification by the JRP for expanding the national education system in a way that will enable it to accommodate refugees.

The approach of integration is further emphasized through a call for inclusive education. This is seen in the discussion around objectives of access and quality. The document states that the aim of the education sector plan is "to ensure sustained access to quality and *inclusive education* for Syrian refugees and vulnerable Jordanians" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 43, emphasis added). The plan specifies in the pillar of access that all students should have access to "inclusive education" (p. 43). In discussing needs for quality education, the JRP (MOPIC, 2016) asserts that teacher training should equip teachers "to establish safe, inclusive learning environments" students "will benefit from more inclusive environments." (p. 43, p. 44). Related to inclusion is the sub-objective calling "to provide a safe, violence-free and protective learning environment which promotes greater social cohesion" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 47).

Related to the JRP is the 30-70 policy, which ensures that any educational program for Syrian refugees also includes Jordanians. The 30-70 policy asserts that in any program designed for Syrian refugees, at least 30 percent of its beneficiaries have to

be Jordanian. The 30-70 policy is rooted in the development discourse and widely seen as a mechanism to ensure that educational programming for refugees serves Jordanians, too. The 30-70 policy also requires that Syrian refugees and Jordanians are included in programs together. This policy led to a large number of refugee education providers paying meticulous attention to their enrollment numbers to ensure that they had the proper balance of Syrians and Jordanians in their programs. These numbers are reported to the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, which approves and oversees all humanitarian and development projects run by international organizations in Jordan.

These policies frame an approach to refugee education that encourages the inclusion of Syrian refugees into the Jordanian education system. Yet, the meaning and goal of inclusion across these policies vary. For the GES, inclusion is primarily seen as a means to achieve quality education for refugees. The 3RP harnesses the guest discourse to encourage social cohesion between Syrians and Jordanians, while also recognizing the need for Jordanian national ownership and leadership, thereby allowing for a benefit to the development of Jordan, too. The JRP also reflects the tension between the guest and development discourses, calling for an inclusive approach to education for Syrians and Jordanians that will foster social cohesion while simultaneously seeking to ensure the protection of its development agenda. This tension foregrounds the activities that take place in FT classrooms and, as I illustrate in subsequent chapters, continues to play out and condition the inclusion of refugees into the community.

Strand III: Forseh Tanieh—The Site of Research

Manar, the FT Education Program Coordinator for the Rufayda Center, led me through the Rufayda School's unpaved courtyard, past the murals of the Jordanian map and flag, and into the school. The entryway was cold and dark, with dust bunnies hiding into the corners. Light peaked in through a floor-to-ceiling window partially covered by a six-foot poster of the Jordanian national anthem. We turned down the hallway and, as we walked, I peeked into some of the classrooms, whose walls were bare save a picture of the King.

We continued down the dark hallway lined with Jordanian flags until we reached FT's Rufayda Center, a refurbished school classroom. We opened the door to a classroom thriving with life and energy. In contrast to the entryway, these walls were covered with student work, brightly colored educational posters, and a large window through which light flooded the room. Rather than the narrow wooden desks and chalkboard found in the rest of the school's classrooms, this room contained round, white tables laid out in a U-shape facing a large white board and a computer screen used to project digital material. In the corner was a supply cabinet filled with papers, pencils, pens, and craft materials such as construction paper, markers, yarn, and glue.

Once all of the students all arrived, Miss Fatima and Miss Zayneb, the teachers, began their lesson. They explained that they had hidden popsicle sticks around the room and instructed the girls to find them. The girls instantly jumped to their feet, walked around the room whispering with their friends, comfortably rummaging through drawers, cabinets, and piles of papers on the teachers' desk. As they found popsicle sticks, they shouted with glee, turning to their teachers for encouragement. Some girls embraced the

spirit of competition and gently teased those who had not found any, while other girls worked in pairs to find sticks together. After ten minutes of searching, the teachers called an end to the game.

The teachers used the activity to spark a math lesson. They asked the girls to line up based on the number of popsicle sticks they had found, beginning with those who found none and increasing progressively. They asked students to put their sticks together to create a particular sum. They had each student report how many sticks they had found, recording the numbers on the board, then asked the students to calculate the total. They continued with several other math-related activities until they eventually collected the popsicle sticks and the students returned to their seats.

This snapshot of the Rufayda Center encapsulates much of what is central to the mission and approach of FT's NFE program.[12] Due to their partnership with the MoE, most FT NFE centers are located in public schools, but both in appearance, approach, and resources, they are very different from other public school classrooms. For example, FT teachers rely on student centered and participatory learning strategies to engage their students and encourage the development of personal relationships between teacher and student as well as among students. The NFE curriculum, while aligned with the MoE's curriculum for formal schooling, focuses heavily on basic literacy and numeracy. and teachers repeat basic concepts like addition and subtraction frequently. The Jordanian students typically come from underprivileged or otherwise "at-risk" backgrounds and,

[12] The NFE program is FT's primary program. FT runs other youth empowerment programs which I do not address in this dissertation. Further, to maintain the anonymity of the organization, I will not describe their other programs.

thus, they are often located in under-resourced, urban neighborhoods or extremely rural communities. Although many of the students struggle in their home lives for various reasons, the FT Centers are frequently considered places of light, enjoyment, and hope.

Forseh Tanieh's Non-Formal Education Program

Forseh Tanieh's NFE program offers a 24 months, accelerated learning program run in collaboration with the MoE and culminates in a 10th grade certificate from the Ministry. It includes three levels of eight months each, covering the formal school curriculum through 10th grade. The NFE program targets male students ages 13-18 and female students ages 13-20 who have previously dropped out of school and are ineligible to re-enroll in public school (by Jordanian law, children who have been out of school for over three years may not reenter the formal school system). Just as in most Jordanian public schools, boys and girls are taught in separate programs. The program is colloquially known as the "dropout program" because, until recently, it catered primarily to Jordanian students who had dropped out of school. When the partnership between FT and the MoE was formalized, the Director of FT was clear that the program must be open to "all children in Jordan" rather than "all Jordanian children" which, according to the Director, "was a very fortuitous move because then that let us help Iraqi [refugees] and that let us help Syrian [refugees] so that made it inclusive" (interview, May 9, 2017). Thus, since the program began in 2003, FT has been open to Jordanian students as well as refugee students who have been out of school due to conflict and are ineligible for public school or, for a variety of reasons I have already discussed in Chapter One, prefer not to attend public school. As a result, FT has been offering inclusive refugee education for

many years, though only recently has it made a concerted effort to recruit refugee students.

Students who complete the tenth grade requirements of the NFE program have different options available to them, depending on whether they are Jordanian citizens or not. Jordanians are eligible to enroll in a national diploma-level vocational training programs or continue to secondary school (through grade twelve with the option to attend tertiary, university-level education). To continue to high school, students must fulfill ninth grade test requirements of the formal school system. If successful, they can enroll in tenth grade through the "home-schooling" track, which allows them to study 11th and 12th grade materials independently and sit for the *tawjihi* exam, the high school exit exam, which would make them eligible for university. Refugee students are also eligible for the vocational training track; however, as international students, they pay 10 times more than the Jordanian students, making it a nearly impossible option for many (personal communication, December 17, 2017). At the time of my research, there was no formal policy as to whether Syrians could continue in the home schooling track; rather, it was decided by the MoE on a case-by-case basis (field notes, July 30, 2017). Yet, from what I observed, teachers encouraged all students equally to pursue both options, often emphasizing vocational training, without specifying the challenges that Syrian students might face. Most students—male and female—choose to continue in the national vocational training track where they can study a variety of trades including plumbing, mechanics, cosmetology, and pastry making. At the time of my research, they did not have data indicating how many students were going to which program.

In 2016, when I was conducting this research, FT had 117 NFE centers throughout the Kingdom of Jordan, 115 in host communities and two in refugee camps. Most centers were physically located in a designated FT classroom within a public school that has been designed and furnished by FT. Classes meet for two hours, five days a week, throughout the entire year. The rationale behind this is that it allows students to maintain jobs or support their families while still getting their education. This reasoning applied more to Jordanian students who could work legally but also to Syrian refugee students who were often working informally. To make up for the shorter school days, classes meet throughout the year, with vacations only for major holidays. Another important feature of the NFE program is that students of all three levels typically study together in a single classroom. The facilitators differentiate their lessons by providing different questions or activities for students of different levels.

FT students come from various backgrounds, but all students left school early for one reason or another and are ineligible or unwilling to return to the formal school system. They come from marginalized backgrounds and low-income communities, and many have been pushed out of the educational system, framed as failures, resulting in psychological, social, and economic problems. Many of the Jordanian students come from abusive households with parents who were unwilling or unable to support their children's educational trajectories (interview, May 18, 2017). Jenan, for example, suffered trauma from an abusive brother and father and dropped out of school after her father attempted to burn down her mother's home. Ruqaya's parents forced her to quit school after enduring months of sexual harassment from a male student on her way home from school. And Lamar, after repeating eighth grade once and ninth grade twice,

tolerating years of ridicule from her peers and corporal punishment from her teachers, finally dropped out of school.

Many refugee students came to FT because they were ineligible for the formal school system and wanted an educational program that would provide them with certification. Isra enrolled in Jordanian schools when she first arrived from Syria but left due to the harassment she experienced from her peers; FT was her only option afterwards. When Fotouh came to Jordan, her parents did not know how to enroll her in school. After three years passed, she was ineligible for public schooling and came to FT. Do'a began in the UNICEF Makani program but felt it a waste of time as she would not get a certificate. When she learned that FT offered a certificate from the MoE, she enrolled and began attending the NFE program.

The MoE stipulated three criteria for the NFE program to operate as a government-certified program. First, FT must use the MoE curriculum, which they adjusted for the NFE program by consolidating the learning objectives and materials into a shortened program. The curriculum focuses primarily on literacy and numeracy, but covers all major school subjects. Second, classes must take place in government facilities, typically schools but not exclusively. Although they are primarily located in the public facilities, FT resourced their classrooms quite differently than public school classrooms as evidenced by a high number of teaching and learning materials, craft supplies, snacks, and at least one computer in every classroom. Additionally, it was typical for FT classes to take place after public school hours, thus there was little interaction between the FT students and the public school students. Third, the facilitators must be licensed teachers who are currently teaching in the formal public school system.

Public school teachers can opt to teach for FT in addition to their regular teaching responsibilities and, in exchange, receive a moderate stipend as remuneration for spending additional time teaching. They spend a full day teaching in public school in addition to their two hours teaching for FT. FT refers to their teachers as *muyasireen*, facilitators, rather than teachers and the classes are called *jalsat*, sessions; this is meant to signal a turn away from rote learning and towards a more democratic, Freirean model of education (which will be discussed in more detail later). Each center has two primary facilitators who are present at the center daily, one teaches math and science and the other teaches Arabic literacy and religion. While they teach different subjects, the facilitators are expected to be present throughout the two hours and support each other while the other is teaching. Each session is two hours long and includes two lessons and a snack provided by FT. In addition to the primary facilitators, each center has an English teacher and a computer teacher who teach one lesson each week.

A facilitator is provided 80-100 hours of training over their first year as a facilitator. The trainings are provided by FT staff, with materials and content that have been developed in collaboration with the MoE. The initial four day training includes an introduction to FT, fundamentals of child and teenage development, and an overview of school dropouts. This includes a discussion of the reasons why students drop out of school, the economic, social and psychological challenges that push kids to drop out of school as well as the challenges they face after having dropped out of school. They learn about the FT pedagogy, the importance of dialogue, and its roots in the work of Paulo Freire (which I discuss later in the chapter). They learn about participatory learning techniques, how to facilitate meaningful class discussions, and how to make their classes

relevant and engaging to students. Facilitators learn how to facilitate group work and professional relationships amongst teachers and FT staff. There is no session in any of the training that addresses refugee issues specifically; however, FT staff told me that the training they receive in working with at risk youth provides adequate preparation to work with a refugee population. I argue in Chapter Seven that that is not the case and that teachers would benefit from additional training in refugee-specific issues. In addition to formal trainings, FT facilitators receive regular observation, check-in meetings, and debriefings from the education program coordinators and the quality assurance team.

At the time of my research, the FT HQ team consisted of approximately 60 people, including education program coordinators, a quality assurance team, a monitoring and evaluation team, project managers, educational specialists, and a financial and operations team. The FT staff was comprised predominantly of Jordanians with a handful of Americans and other Western staff members. I worked most closely with the education program coordinators (EPC), each of whom oversaw six to eight FT centers. EPCs conduct regular visits to the NFE centers and are responsible for registering students, monitoring the center budgets, and supervising the facilitators, among other things.

"Paulo Freire is Still Alive in our Centers": The FT Participatory Teaching Philosophy

According to FT staff at the HQ level, the core of FT's program, that distinguishes it from other educational programs in Jordan, is its participatory pedagogy, what they call the Participatory Learning Method (PLM). The goal of the PLM, and the NFE program as a whole, is to empower their students to serve as active agents of change in their own lives and in their communities. It builds on a theory of change that suggests

that with a supportive environment, engaging and relevant learning materials, and positive mentorship, youth will develop improved well-being, critical thinking skills, and an increased capacity to have positive impact on their lives and their community (Oxford, 2011). FT seeks to engage and empower marginalized youth with knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will foster their active inclusion in mainstream society. In this section, I compare the theories behind the three primary tools they use to cultivate this empowerment with the practices as I saw them in class and point to the disconnect between the intentions and the practices.

The founder of FT cites three theorists as instrumental to the philosophy of the organization and its pedagogical approach: Robert Chambers, Jean Vanier, and Paulo Freire. FT's PLM builds on Chambers' (1983) work on participation in international development, emphasizing the notion that empowering the beneficiaries of a development project—in the case of FT, the students—will contribute to the project's success and sustainability, and will allow for meaningful change. Jean Vanier is a Catholic philosopher and humanitarian aid worker known for his work with youth with disabilities. FT builds on his work around spiritual growth and recognizing that the program beneficiaries (the students) are human beings and deserve to be treated as such. For FT, this helps move the learning relationship from one that is transactional to one that is transformative.

Although the work of Chambers and Vanier impacted the PLM, it is nearly impossible to speak with upper-level FT staff about their program without hearing the name Paulo Freire, or as one interviewee called him, "my Uncle Paulo" (interview, July 26, 2017). His notion of critical pedagogy and, primarily, his ideas around dialogue,

generative themes, and the student teacher relationship, are central to the organization and its teaching approach. The core of critical pedagogy is that in order to liberate the oppressed through education, they must be equipped with tools to identify their oppression "not as a closed world from which there is no exit, but as a limiting situation which they can transform" (Freire, 2003, p. 49) This social change envisioned by Freire is accomplished through cultivating critical consciousness.

Dialogue. In order to achieve critical consciousness, Freire introduced the use of dialogue as a pedagogical practice wherein students and teachers engage in discussion and debate about their sociopolitical realities (Bartlett, 2005). The concept of dialogue recognizes that knowledge is not a commodity to be deposited from teacher into student, what Freire calls the "banking model" of education; rather, students should be co-creators of knowledge alongside teachers. This requires a "problem posing" approach, where students and teachers learn together.

Generative theme. The content of the curriculum in the problem-posing approach rests on generative themes which are developed in a collaborative approach between the student and teacher. Generative themes, so-called because they "contain the possibility of unfolding into again as many themes," (Freire, 2003, p. 103) are thematic topics that are important to the students themselves. They must be grounded in students' lived experiences and through dialogue and debate around these themes, students and teachers come to better understand their own realities. Indeed, these themes "do not exist 'out there' somewhere, as static entities; *they are occurring"* and cannot be understood apart from "the people who embody them and the reality to which they refer" (Freire, 2003, p. 107). The investigation of these themes involves "striving towards awareness of

reality and towards self-awareness;" once the reality is identified and understood, people can begin to liberate themselves from the oppression they face.

Student-teacher relationship. Freire's model of transformative education rests on the loving relationship between student and teacher. The relationship should be a "horizontal relationship" that seeks to overturn the power imbalance between them. Through a problem-posing method of teaching, "The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow" (Freire, 2013, p. 42). Through this relationship, student and teacher learn together, "nourished by love, humility, hope, faith, and trust" (Freire, 2013, p. 42). I explore the ways that student-teacher relationships contribute to and complicate a culture of inclusion in Chapter Seven.

While Freire and his ideas of critical pedagogy were central to education staff at FT HQ, and they trickled down to the teachers and their teaching practices through trainings, it was clear that very few FT staff or teachers had really engaged with Freire's work in any in-depth way. Much like Bartlett (2005) found in her ethnographic work exploring Freirean pedagogy adult education programs in Brazil, very few of FT staff had read any of Freire's work or engaged with Freirean ideas beyond brief summaries and overviews. Moreover, this dissertation is not meant to be a study of critical pedagogy and its implementation, rather an examination of inclusive refugee education. Because of this, I follow the approach employed by Bartlett's (2005) in focusing on staff's "understanding and enactment" of Freirean ideas and their implications for inclusive refugee education (p. 351), rather than evaluating them against my own reading of Freire's work itself. In

the following section, I draw on interviews and conversations with FT HQ staff to introduce and analyze the three primary tools employed in the PLM.

"Bread and Butter of the FT Pedagogy": Interrogating the Use of Dialogue, Generative Texts, and Activities

According to FT staff at the HQ level, there are three teaching techniques that contribute to the participatory pedagogy of the FT program: dialogue, the generative text (what Freire called generative themes), and activities. Mashhour, one of the FT quality assurance officers, explained the importance of these three techniques as follows:

> [Dialogue, the generative text, and activities] are the bread and butter of the pedagogy. Those are the core of the methodology. There are a lot of other things, but if we have those three things [in a class session], it's a good session. If you lose the dialogue, [a student] might learn something, but I want him to talk… I want him to think. If you don't have activities, it's going to be a rigid, boring lesson. It will become like formal education. If you don't have the generative text, it's like I have a Land Rover without an engine, it's nice but it's not going to do anything. (Interview, July 27, 2017)

According to Yazar and other staff members I spoke with, these three techniques represent a formula of FT best practices to teaching that will lead to active student engagement and participation. In this way, FT attempted to operationalize Freire's critical pedagogy so that it can be implemented by teachers, even without a full understanding of its intentions. Yet, as I will show in this section, there was a disconnect between the conceptions of these methods at the HQ level and their implementation in the FT classrooms.

Dialogue, for the HQ staff, meant providing students opportunities to share their ideas, which would lead to a sense of importance and worth in the classroom. It was also meant to raise a sense of awareness of broad social challenges that youth in Jordan face. According to one of the Program Managers, dialogue "is a way of gaining awareness. Through dialogue, you should allow students to speak safely without interrupting them, even if their ideas are not correct" (interview, July 26, 2017). While he asserted that dialogue was meant to help raise awareness and create a safe space, he also pointed to the presence of a 'correct answer.' Regarding refugees, despite the emphasis on awareness-raising driven by students' interest, facilitators are trained to regulate what qualifies as a 'correct' idea. Alaa, one of the FT Program Managers explained that FT facilitators are trained to "put all the [national] differences aside. We don't talk about differences in nationality, in language, in religion, *even if the students brought it up*" (interview, July 27, 2017). Facilitators were trained to see that "we're all brothers" and redirect discussions about differences aside, even when the it comes from the student. Thus, the approach to a transformation pedagogy is restricted to transformations deemed palatable by FT; this limits the possibility to overturn oppression, particularly for refugees.

Dialogue was also seen by FT staff as a way to overcome some of the shame and trauma students may have had in the public school system. The Director of Education explained:

> [Dialogue] gives kids a chance to talk and to feel important. If the adult allows them to say things, the child will feel important and feel like the teacher is listening…From this dialogue, everyone develops knowledge and learns something new. (Interview, September 7, 2016)

That is, having conversations with students and eliciting their opinions is a way to help students feel valuable and worthy. In a context where many students had been shamed and ridiculed in previous schooling experiences, this respect from the teachers was important to students. Yet, there seemed to be a gap between inviting student participation in a discussion and the co-construction of knowledge that will raise awareness of the world and let them transform it in the way envisaged by Freire (2013). Indeed, the practices of dialogue I saw in the classrooms took the shape of engaged class discussions where students responded to questions posed by their teachers. Yet, like Bartlett (2005) found in her study of Freirean pedagogy in Brazil, the dialogue entailed "personable chatting" rather than a deep analysis of the social or political situation in which any of the students were living, refugee or not (p. 356).

According to FT staff, through dialogue, students and teachers collaboratively produce the generative text, a central text—usually a sentence or a paragraph—which is used as a springboard from which to teach a range of topics, including literacy and numeracy. According to FT, generative text should be intimately tied to the students' everyday lives so they "feel that what they are learning and studying is part of them, and that they are part of the process" (interview, November 10, 2016). For example, in one class I visited in November during the heart of the olive season, the students were working from a text that translated into: olive trees are perennials and live for thousands of years. The teacher provided a series of 14 questions about olive trees and the students worked in small groups to answer the questions. The questions included:

- What cities in Jordan are known for olive trees?

- Identify the verb in the sentence and then conjugate it in past, present, and command form
- Where in the Quran are olive trees mentioned?
- Where else in the Arab world can you find olive trees? (Field notes, November 2, 2016)

By drawing on a single sentence, the teacher incorporated learning about grammar, geography, and religion. Yet, despite the emphasis on the generative text at the HQ level as a central component of the FT approach, I only saw it employed three times over my year of research. The three times I saw it in use, it always revolved around a banal topic without a deeper sociopolitical excavation. Thus, while the generative text was envisioned at the HQ level of as a tool to generate critical consciousness and social change, its application was much more mundane, the few times it occurred.

The final teaching technique, which is critical to the FT pedagogy and meant to build a caring student-teacher relationship, is the use of activities both within the classroom as well as extra-curricular activities. Activities included small group work, art projects, or the use of educational games in and out of the classroom. According to FT, the use of activities in the class contributes to an interactive and participatory pedagogy and distinguishes their program from public schools. During my observations at FT, I saw teachers use activities frequently. Sometimes they were in the place of a lesson, like a group breakfast at the start of a session or an excursion to a nearby park. Other times, they were used as learning tools in the classroom. While I observed teachers implement student-centered activities in the classroom, often drawing on small group work to reinforce learning, the activities were often interspersed between periods of teacher-

centered, role learning. This depended to an extent on the particular teacher and her comfort level with participatory learning activities, but it was not uncommon to see more traditional, rote learning techniques. This finding is reinforced by Magee and Pherali's (2017) study of FT, who argued the emphasis on creative, student-centered learning was often seen as a barrier to preparing students for exams and receiving a certification. Certification was, indeed, an important aspect of the FT education program and has been shown to be a priority for refugees (Culbertson & Constant, 2015; Kirk, 2009).

My analysis of FT's techniques points to a tension between their intentions of critical pedagogy and social change and the practice of a student-centered learning approach. Moreover, I have pointed to ways that the FT approach integrates the notion of "we're all brothers" and embraces an inclusive approach that avoids discussing different or helping refugee students identify and overcome particular challenges. Like Bartlett (2005), I found that these techniques did a great deal to cultivate a safe space for students, a productive learning environment, and warm relationships between students and teachers. There also were even opportunities for teachers to discuss social issues with youth, like early marriage and the value of education. Yet, the notion of "we're all brothers" that permeated FT, like it did throughout Jordan, perpetuated a difference-blindness that was never interrogated, despite the claim of using critical pedagogy. Rather than turning a critical gaze on social relationships or the status of refugees in the country, FT administrators and teachers actually encouraged the notion of "we're all brothers," therefore reinforcing and reifying the inequality and the conditionality of hospitality towards refugees.

Research Sites

As I described in Chapter Three, a key component of my field research included participant observation in three FT Centers, which I call the HYC, the Rufayda bint Sa'ad al-Aslamiyya Center (Rufayda Center), and the Asma bint Marwan Center (Asma Center). Each center was located in an urban area in Jordan and included students of many nationalities, including Syrian refugees, Jordanians, Palestinians, Egyptians, and Iraqi refugees, though this dissertation focuses primarily on the Syrians. The Rufayda Center and the Asma Center were both located in public schools, included only female students, and the teachers were public school teachers trained and certified by the MoE. It was FT who connected me with the Rufayda and Asma Centers and who facilitated my research, observations, and interviews there. Thus, during my observations, I was always accompanied by an FT Education Program Coordinator (EPC).

The EPC was essential for my transportation to the sites, which were otherwise inaccessible to me as a foreigner without a car, and helpful in debriefing what we observed after the observation. At the Rufayda Center, the EPC always stayed in the classroom with me, sometimes reviewing paperwork with the teachers and other times playing on her phone. I found her presence intimidating at times and I did not interact with the teachers often, especially because they were busy. Yet, I was able to sit with the students and participate in the lessons alongside them. The EPC who took me to the Asma Center rarely stayed in the classroom with me. He typically sat in the principal's office or outside smoking and, therefore, I felt much more comfortable to ask questions and engage the students and teachers. Additionally, he was very interested in my research and actually served as an excellent sounding board in debriefing what I saw and what I

was thinking. The EPCs were extremely busy and while they were able to conduct some work at the site during my observations, I recognize that the weekly two hours we spent at the sites, plus transportation time, took up a good deal of their working time. As such, there was sometimes pressure to arrive late or leave early, which was understandable and out of my control. I am grateful to the three EPCs, Manar, Lubna, and Khaled, who facilitated my observations in these two sites.

The HYC was unique in several ways. First, unlike the Rufayda and Asma Centers, I came to know the HYC through an independent connection with the Director of the center. In fact, when I began volunteering at the HYC, I did not know it facilitated an FT NFE program. The HYC was a community center supported by a local NGO that hosted several programs, of which the NFE program was one. Once I learned that, I spent the majority of my time with the NFE program. Second, because I went on my own time, I was able to spend significantly more time with the HYC and was able to give back to the community through teaching and other volunteer activities. Third, since the HYC's NFE program was a collaboration between FT and another organization, its structure was slightly different. The female teachers were not MoE employees and public school teachers, but rather employees of the youth center itself (although for reasons I never quite understood, the male teachers were public school teachers and MoE employees). While typical FT centers like the Rufayda and Asma Centers served only one gender, the HYC had male and female students, with girls attending in the morning and boys in the afternoon. While I observed both the morning and afternoon, my research focuses on girls.

The Rufayda Center: "This center is an opportunity for every girl." FT established the Rufayda Center two years prior to my research, and the EPCs considered it one of its most successful centers. According to Manar, the EPC who oversaw the center and first escorted me on my visits, the quality of education was high, and both the students and parents were pleased with the program. The classroom was small but colorful. A large green rug covered the floor and bright red and orange chairs surrounded four white tables, making a U-shape around the room. Colorful drawings of each student's name hung on the wall with an envelope in which girls would leave each other notes along with students' work and educational posters. The small whiteboard stood off to the side and, above it, was a TV screen connected to the computer on which teachers would show educational videos.

There were 25 students enrolled at the Rufayda Center, but only 16 students attended regularly. Those who came typically sat around three different tables, clustered into different social cliques. There were six Syrian students registered, although only two attended regularly. The two Syrian girls, Amira and Raneem, were in the same social circle, but Amira was a new student and Raneem was preparing to graduate. When the students arrived at the center each afternoon, they walked around the room and greeted each student by shaking their hand and saying hello. They would kiss each facilitator on the cheek and then sit in their seat, where they would talk with their friends until the lesson began.

The two main facilitators at the Rufayda Center were Miss Fatima, the Arabic teacher, and Miss Zaineb, the Math and Science teacher. They both taught at the public school in which the center was based. Unfortunately, I did not get to know either of them

very well during my three months at the center because they were usually occupied teaching or meeting with the EPC during my observations. Over the three months that I visited the Rufayda Center, I worked with two EPCs, Manar and Lubna. Because I relied on the EPC to drive me to the center and I could not control our punctuality, we generally arrived just as the lesson was beginning, or shortly after it had begun. When the teachers were not teaching, they were usually busy preparing for other lessons or completing paperwork with Manar or Lubna. This left little time for me to speak with them and build a relationship with them. I was, however, able to observe several Arabic, Science and Computer classes as well as a few special activities and events. Additionally, while I am aware that my presence likely impacted the teachers, it is likely that the presence of their boss, Lubna, added additional pressure on both students and teachers to perform.

Given my limited time at the Rufayda Center, I focused on building relationships with the students. I usually sat with the students and participated in whatever activity they were doing. This allowed me to get to know the girls and join in their conversations, as best I could. In the beginning, students geared their conversations towards me and asked me many of questions about America and my impressions of Jordan. After a few weeks, the novelty of having a foreigner in the classroom wore off and they returned to their typical conversations.

The Asma Center: "Every morning, I can't wait to come here." The Asma Center was located at the end of a narrow road in a busy, urban neighborhood. Inside the school gate stood a large school building painted with proverbs and motivational slogans about caring for health and the environment. The ceilings in the school hung low and the hallways felt dark. The walls of the hall were lined with patriotic posters, motivational

quotes, and Jordanian flags. Walking down the hall to the Asma Center classroom felt slightly foreboding; this feeling changed completely upon entering the room.

The Asma Center was bright and colorful, and light poured through the three windows. The walls were covered in purple paper which was barely visible due to the number of posters and student work hanging on top of it. The students and teachers created a behavior contract which hung on the wall, along with vocabulary words and pictures, and poster board and flip chart paper with academic content. Everything hanging on the wall included bright colors and drawings made by students. On the floor around the door was tape that made up a compass, where the position of the door showed different angles.

I observed in my field notes that the atmosphere of the Asma Center felt "busy and fast paced." The walls were cluttered and the facilitators spoke with a contagious energy and enthusiasm. I noted further, "I sensed it was a lot of organized chaos—there was also a lot going on all the time, but in a good way" (field notes, April 24, 2017)

There were never more than twelve students present at a lesson and, because it was Ramadan, some lessons had as few as five students. There were four Syrian refugee students who attended the Asma Center, and an Egyptian student who did not have Jordanian citizenship papers. The students expressed mix feelings about their peers, some noting that the students were very close (saying "we are all one hand") and others using more neutral language (by casually saying, the students "are fine"). Huda, a Jordanian student, told me the following when I inquired about her relationship with the other students:

> We work together, get along together, in our studies and in our activities. We talk together when we are at home, too. We are always in touch. For example, if a girl was absent, I might tell her, don't be absent tomorrow because we have this activity coming up. We give each other information and help each other. (Interview, July 31, 2017)

In contrast, Haneen, also a Jordanian student, expressed a sense of neutrality towards the other students, noting that "the girls are nice, they're fine." She explained that she felt close to two students, but did not have much of a relationship with the rest of the students (interview, July 31, 2017). Walaa, one of the advanced students at the Asma Center and of Egyptian citizenship, indicated that there was occasionally tension between the students. She stated that "the girls, some of them, well, they're not like really really good," and proceeded to complain about students with bad hygiene and high levels of gossip between the students (interview, August 2, 2017).

The Asma Center was led by two facilitators, Miss Ilham and Miss Lamis. Miss Ilham was an elementary school math teacher and Miss Lamis teaches Arabic. While Miss Lamis had been with the Asma Center since it opened a few years ago, Miss Ilham only joined the team in January of 2016. Although she was newer to FT and has not attended all the FT trainings, Ilham excelled at participatory teaching and the lessons I observed were always creative and interactive. Additionally, she demonstrated passion for teaching and exuded warmth and kindness. Miss Ilham always spent time at the beginning of the class talking casually with the students, building her relationship with them. During her lessons, she was quick to praise students for work well done and provide supportive encouragement when a student had a bit more work to do. Miss Lamis

was typically more reserved and, while I observed some lessons with discussion and small group work, many of her lessons more closely resembled a traditional, lecture-style class.

A large portion of the time I spent at the Asma Center was during Ramadan, the Muslim holy month when most people are fasting. This meant that, although classes continued, "the center [was] running a bit more slowly and casually" (field notes, June 1, 2017). Miss Ilham, who was pregnant, was not fasting and, thus, maintained her high energy levels; Miss Lamis, however, and all the students were fasting and, as a result, moved at a slower pace. Additionally, because of Ramadan, student absence levels were higher than usual.

The Hashemite Youth Center: "I don't want to miss a day." The HYC was a very different type of NFE center than the Asma and Rufayda Center, as was the nature of my work there. The HYC was a collaboration between FT and another local NGO housed in a privately owned space, not a public school. Unlike other centers, which had a maximum of 25 students of one sex, and placed students of all levels in one classroom, the HYC ran four girls' classes in the morning, divided by level, and four boys classes in the afternoon, also divided by level. The staff included six female teachers, who were full-time employees of the NGO and taught in the four classes, a guidance counselor, a psychologist, and full-time Director of Education employed directly by the MoE. There were also six male teachers who were MoE teachers that came just in the afternoon to teach the boys. As part of a larger NGO, the center had additional resources which enabled it to run extra workshops and activities for the students.

The HYC campus was fairly large and included several amenities not available at other FT centers. There was a full courtyard where students would hang out in the morning, with an area to play soccer, a garden, and benches to sit on. There was a computer lab, a cinema room, a play room, and a 'creativity room,' where students could go play with instruments or various art supplies. There was also a small library from which students could borrow books. In addition to the NFE program, two classrooms were used for an informal education program for refugee and other vulnerable children between the ages of six to 11. During my time at the HYC, they were also equipping another classroom with special accommodations and technology to be used for a special needs initiative.

I spent two days a week at the HYC, conducting observations and teaching English in both the boys and girls classes. I also taught an elective workshop, one for girls and one for boys, whose purpose was to provide additional English language learning opportunities for students. Students chose to participate in this elective, which met once a week. As a part of the workshop, we engaged in a cultural exchange with an Arabic class in London. Through this exchange, I led conversations with the students about cross-cultural communication. In addition to my observations, because I was there all day, I came to know the female teachers well. I spent time with them in the teachers' lounge before classes began and during the two-hour lunch break.

It was at the HYC where I had the best relationships with students and teachers, and spent time with several of the students outside of the HYC space. There were three Syrian students, Dana, Ghofran, and Rasha, who invited me to their home at the Hope House several times. The Hope House was a complex for Syrian refugee families whose

husbands or fathers were absent (some had died in the war while others remained in Syria). The Hope House provided housing, education, and other services to the women and children living there. I was only able to spend three days at Hope House with Dana, Ghofran, Rasha and their families, due to its distance from my home. Instead, we built our relationship through texting on WhatsApp and speaking on the phone.

I also became quite close to Jenan, a Jordanian student, and her mother. I spent several days visiting with them at their home, went on a day trip with them to the ancient roman site of Jerash, and continue to chat with Jenan through Facebook messenger. Jenan's father and brothers were abusive to her and forced her to leave school after seventh grade. Although her parents separated and she rarely saw her father, she continued to suffer physical and verbal abuse from her brothers. At the end of my fieldwork, Jenan and her mother were unable to pay their rent and feared they would soon become homeless. Despite these dire circumstance, Jenan was one of the most motivated students I came to know at the HYC. In addition to attending the NFE program at the HYC, she attended lectures at the University of Jordan and a vocational training program at another community center. When I left Jordan, Jenan had begun studying for the *tawjihi* and hoped to take the high school exit exam and continue to university in the next couple of years.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have demonstrated that the contexts in which this study takes place are varied and overlapping. They illustrate the circulation of various tensions and contradictions that contribute to attitudes and understandings of refugees and,

subsequently, shape the ways that students and teachers understand and making meaning of the context of inclusive refugee education. The discursive context shapes refugee hospitality as conditional and frames the refugee situation as a threat to development and security. The tension between brotherhood on the one hand, and resentment towards refugees on the other serves as a central element in the forthcoming chapters and the ways that Syrians and Jordanians construct and navigate the inclusive educational space. The supposed threat that refugees pose to development can be seen in the policy context through the melding of humanitarian and development responses, which places authority over refugee services such as education in the hands of national ministries. These policies have resulted in the structuring of refugee education services in Jordan in such a way that requires the presence of Jordanians in all refugee services. These tensions shape the structure of inclusive refugee education as one that draws on the Jordanian curriculum and Jordanian teachers. As I illustrate in subsequent chapters, this form of structural integration is not always in the best interest of refugee students. Finally, within FT, there is a tension between the theoretical approach to teaching, which is based on Freirean notions of critical pedagogy, and practices in the classroom that tend towards student-centered pedagogy, without an element of transformation and liberation. As the goal of critical pedagogy falls short in the classroom, questions can be raised about the possibilities for inclusion, transformation, and social justice.

Chapter Five: Creating and Conditioning a Culture of Inclusion

Amina and I rode on the same bus to the HYC. Amina was an Iraqi refugee who had grown up in Syria with her family, and came to Jordan after the war in Syria started. She often sat by herself on the bus, preferring to avoid the drama and gossip of the other girls. When the bus monitor was not present, Amina took attendance. The moment our bus would arrive at the HYC, I noticed a visible change in her attitude as she skipped off with her two best friends, a Palestinian from Gaza and a Jordanian. I often saw the three of them linked arms and walking around the courtyard, talking and giggling.

Dana, a 17-year-old, Syrian student was usually the first one to greet me when I got off the bus. She would take my hand and walk me over to her friend Ghofran, another Syrian student. We would chat about our previous day until Dana saw Jenan's bus pull into the parking lot, at which point she would squeal and dash over to greet her. Jenan was a Jordanian student in Dana's class and they had become close friends. Dana would embrace Jenan with a warm hug as she exited the bus and bring her over to our group, often picking up a few more friends along the way. Some mornings I found myself looking around and taking in the scene: dozens of young women of diverse nationalities and citizenship status engaged in conversations with their friends, joking and laughing, and excited to start another day at school.

On the surface, it seemed to me that the Syrian students experienced a strong sense of inclusion and belonging in the FT space. While Syrian refugees experienced a wide range of hardships in their home lives, as I explained in Chapter One, FT seemed to be a mutual space for Syrians and Jordanians to gather, learn, and feel safe. In the months I spent at FT teaching, observing, and getting to know students, I never witnessed any

direct bullying or violence towards Syrian refugees, which contradicted much of the literature on public school education in Jordan that points to high levels of discrimination and bullying towards Syrians and violence between Syrian and Jordanian students (Human Rights Watch, 2016). FT was not only a space absent of violence, but it was a place also of enjoyment and happiness for Syrian refugee students. It was a place where they socialized with both Syrian and Jordanian peers, built social connections across nationalities, and felt supported and encouraged.

In this chapter, I argue that the space of inclusive refugee education offers opportunities for Syrian refugees and Jordanian students to construct and produce new forms of belonging that tend towards greater inclusion for all students. By *belonging* I refer to the emotional attachment (Yuval-Davis, 2006, 2011) and sense of "at-homeness" (Shirazi, 2018, p. 97) experienced by Syrian refugees in FT. Belonging is always constructed by and navigated through the *politics of belonging*, the constructions of larger social and political boundaries that mediate inclusion and exclusion. By drawing on a dual analytical lens of belonging and the politics of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006, 2011) to analyze the process of sociocultural inclusion (Bellino & Dryden-Peterson, 2018) among Syrian refugee youth and Jordanian youth in FT, I illuminate the ways that belonging is conditioned by Jordanians to shape the contours of inclusion, and also how that inclusion is refashioned by Syrian youth as they draw on transnationalism. I found that belonging was conditioned primarily in two ways: language use and expressions of gratitude. By this I mean that Jordanian students expected Syrians to speak in the local language and expected them to express unconditional gratitude towards Jordan for hosting them. This chapter contributes to the emerging scholarship on belonging in

spaces of inclusive refugee education. Drawing on the theory of belonging offers analytical clarity to the concept of inclusion. Additionally, I expand the current work on inclusive refugee education by moving beyond a structural understanding of the concept to illustrate how inclusive refugee education acts as a space to both construct, condition, and navigate inclusion.

I begin this chapter by providing an overview of the theory of belonging (Antonsich, 2010; Yuval-Davis, 2011). I then discuss how the societal discourse of "we're all brothers" that I introduced in Chapter Four gets taken up in FT as a discourse of sisterhood which underscores the construction of belonging in FT. Next, I present ethnographic data from the workshop I taught at the HYC to illustrate how youth in FT constructed a shared sense of belonging by constructing shared social locations. This shared social location is challenged as Jordanian youth condition the speech of Syrian refugees, particularly around language use and attitudes towards Jordan. I conclude by also pointing to the ways that Syrian youth draw on their transnational lives to navigate and construct their own sense of inclusion in FT.

Belonging and the Politics of Belonging

Belonging is a dynamic and ongoing process involving some form of emotional attachment to people, places, or particular collectivities (Antonsich, 2010; Yuval-Davis, 2011). Belonging is relational, with an "affective dimension relating to social bonds and ties" (Anthias, 2006, p. 21). It is about a feeling of both being a part of and being accepted by a community and a sense of safety, and comfort as well as social relationships within that community. In this understanding, belonging is relational and

tied to the "formal and informal *experiences* of belonging" (Anthias, 2006, p. 21) at varying and multiple scales, from the very local level to the transnational (Antonsich, 2010; Spaaij, 2015). In this chapter, I focus on Syrian refugees' experiences of local belonging within FT.

Yuval-Davis (2006, 2011) outlines three facets through which belonging is constructed: social locations, identification and emotional attachment, and ethical and political values. By social location, Yuval-Davis (2011) referred to social categories like a "particular sex, race, class, or nation…age group, kinship group or certain profession" to which an individual belongs (p. 12). She explains that social locations are fluid and may be contested throughout space and time. That is, Syrian refugee students identify with differing social locations (like gender, ethnicity, student status, citizenship status) at different points in time, and depending on where they are and who they are with. By identification and emotional attachments, Yuval-Davis explains that "identities are narratives, stories people tell themselves and others about who they are" and, therefore, who or what they are attached to (2011, p. 14). Identity narratives can be individual or collective and provide people with "a sense of order and meaning" (p. 14). The sense of order that identity narratives provide is particularly important given that identities are always in process and constantly being produced and reproduced. Hovil (2016) drew on Brenner (1993) to explain identity as the process of "naming of self, naming of others and being named by others" (p. 25). This concept of identity brings into account not only an individual's self-perception, but also the ways in which that individual perceives and is perceived by others. This notion of perception brings us to the third way in which belonging is constructed, which is through ethical and political values. That is, belonging

is also about how these social locations, identities, and attachments are valued and judged, through the ethical and political value systems of oneself and of others.

As I will demonstrate in this chapter, the fluidity of these social locations and identifications among students in FT is, in part, what enables them to build a shared sense of belonging. That is, when they can see themselves as students, or girls, or Arabs, there is a shared sense of belonging. In this way, they are unified under a shared narrative of sameness that I will describe below. Yet, when Syrian refugee students make visible contrasting identities, like their identities as Syrians, belonging is challenged. The fluidity of social locations and identifications, too, enables Syrian refugee youth to draw on transnational networks to support a sense of belonging, particularly in moments when belonging in the local context is challenged.

In another effort to explicate the meaning of belonging as an emotional attachment and feeling at-home, Antonsich (2010) identified five factors highlighted in the literature which generate a feeling of belonging: autobiographical, relational, cultural, economic, and legal. Particularly related to the belonging constructed and experienced in FT are the autobiographical, relational, and cultural factors. Autobiographical factors include an individual's history and their "personal experiences, relations, and memories" that generate attachment to a particular place or space (Ansonsich, 2010, p. 647). Relational factors relate to the personal and social connections, friendships, and relationships that "enrich the life of an individual" (p. 648). Cultural factors vary and include "traditions and habits," religious practices, and the "materiality of cultural practices like…food production" (Antonsich, 2010, p. 648). Antonsich notes that a shared

language is considered the most important cultural factor for cultivating a sense of belonging.

Notions of belonging as constructed by "imaginings" of shared social locations or identities tend to "gloss over the fissures, the losses, the absences, and the borders within them," which are revealed in analysis of the politics of belonging (Anthias, 2006, p. 21). That is, belonging is not only a personal or communal matter of emotional attachment, but also a social and political endeavor (Antonsich, 2010), what Yuval-Davis (2011) calls the politics of belonging. According to Yuval-Davis, "The politics of belonging involves the construction of boundaries and inclusion/exclusion of particular people, social categories and groupings within these boundaries by those who have the power to do this" (p. 18). In constructing boundaries of who belongs in a collective (whether that is a local community or larger nation), those with dominant (political) power have the ability to determine who belongs and who does not belong. Antonsich (2010) adds that the personal feelings of belonging are always mediated by discourses and practices that construct, claim, and justify who is included and excluded. It is through these discourses and practices that communities are separated into 'us' and 'them'.

The politics of belonging has been conceptualized as an ongoing dialectical process between two sides: the seekers, those claiming to belong, and the granters, those with the power to grant belonging (Antonsich, 2010; Spaaj, 2015). The politics of belonging includes negotiation and navigation around what is involved in belonging. As I demonstrate in this chapter, both Jordanian students and Syrian refugees engage in this process of negotiation as they navigate different ways of seeking and granting belonging. As Yuval-Davis (2006) writes, "the politics of belonging involves not only the

maintenance and reproduction of the boundaries of the community of belonging by the hegemonic political powers but also their contestation and challenge by other political agents" (p. 206).

This quote points to two important points for this chapter. First, while Jordanian students may hold power to maintain the "community of belonging" according to dominant social and political norms, power is not unidimensional and Syrian students can and do play a role in contesting and challenging the boundaries of belonging, creating a dynamic process of reconstruction and inclusion. Second is that not all Jordanian students are involved in maintaining hegemonic status quo. Rather, as I show in this chapter, Jordanian students participate alongside Syrian refugee students to construct new cultural forms of belonging. Inclusion is constructed and negotiated through a discursive mechanism of sameness and the practices of friendship that unfold in FT.

"We're All Sisters, We're All the Same": Discourses of Belonging within Forseh Tanieh

The sense of belonging cultivated in FT was driven by the discursive sense of sameness and sisterhood that I introduced in the previous chapter. Students and teachers upheld an ideology of sameness where they perceived themselves as sharing social locations and emotional attachments as human beings, as Arabs, and as Muslims. These perceived shared identities enabled them to construct a sense of belonging for all students within FT. Students and teachers explained to me, "we're all sisters, we're all the same." I heard this idea of sameness from teachers in class, from students in their conversations in the halls, and from FT HQ staff and trainers in their offices. There is much to critique

about this sense of sameness and the way that it ignores the particular precariousness of Syrian refugees in Jordan: it echoes widely criticized notions of colorblindness seen in the United States (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) and denies the specific challenges of forced displacement. I draw out this critique further in Chapter Seven. Yet, in the context of FT where all students come from vulnerable situations and generally share a low socioeconomic status in society, they drew on a shared sense of marginality to build belonging for all students. This refrain of sisterhood and sameness drew on three categories of sameness: (1) a general humanity common across all people; (2) religious sameness; (3) ethnic Arab sameness. That is, students saw themselves as sharing religious (Muslim) and ethnic (Arab) cultural identities, factors which Antonsich (2010) argues serve as building blocks of belonging.

The Sameness of Humanity

During casual conversations and interviews with FT students about the diversity of nationalities within FT, they were quick to point out that "at the end of the day, we are all humans" (interview, July 17, 2017). In positing this common sense of humanity, Syrian and Jordanian students asserted their acceptance of the (national) other. Sundus, a Jordanian student at the Rufayda Center, explained that "We are all the same. You have a hand, I have a hand. You have eyes and I have eyes. What's the difference? There is no difference!" (interview, July 24, 2017). She went on to explain that by being in the same school together, she was able to learn about their culture, which helped her understand Syrians and interact with them fittingly. Fatima, a Jordanian student at the Asma Center explained that "we are all human, we live in the same environment, we should not be divided" (interview, August 2, 2017). She noted that if Syrians were separated from

Jordanians, "they would feel like they are lesser than us, and they would feel different from the Jordanians." In saying this, she emphasized the sameness of Syrians and Jordanians and a desire to promote equality through integration. By recognizing that Syrians and Jordanians shared a common humanity, students were able to see themselves in the other and build a sense of empathy and support.

Shared Muslim Identity

Students often referred to others, particularly those of differing nationalities, as their brothers and sisters. When I asked Jenan, a student at the Youth Center, what she meant by sister, she explained that "We are sisters in Islam and we all came from Adam and Eve" (interview, July 23, 2017). Arwa at the Rufayda Center asserted, "Country doesn't matter as much as religion. Religion is the most important thing" (interview, July 26, 2016). Muna at the HYC shared this sentiment by telling me the following:

> We're all the same. It doesn't matter if you're Syrian or Jordanian and Palestinian, we wouldn't say that we wouldn't hang out with you. No, we are all the same, we are all sisters, we're all Muslims. (Interview, April 12, 2017)

By sharing a religion, Syrian and Jordanian students could imagine a community of shared practices and beliefs.

I also saw the importance of Islamic unity and values come through in conversations students had about other students' behaviors. There was an emphasis from teachers, administrators and students on morality and the mediation and moderation of students' actions. Frequently students told me that "there are good people and there are bad people. What is important is the good person, through his behavior he makes people love and respect him" (interview, July 19, 2017). That is, what is important is not

nationality as much as a person's behavior. The underlying implication here is that those people who adhere to Muslim values will be accepted in the school, regardless of their nationality. Islam served as a shared cultural and moral factor through which all students could generate a sense of belonging to the FT community.

A Shared Arab Identity

The final category of sameness revolved around a shared Arab identity. There was a commonly circulated idea that Syrians and Jordanians were all Arab and, therefore, all the same. This notion was encapsulated well by Walaa, an Egyptian student at the Asma Center:

> Walaa: We're all one. There is no Syrian, Jordanian, or Egyptian. We're all one
>
> Elly: What does that mean, you're all one?
>
> Walaa: We are all one. *We are all Arabs*. We are all people. There is no difference between Egyptian, Syrian, Jordanian. *No, we are all Arabs.*

In this excerpt, Walaa claimed that students of diverse nationalities in her class are all one because of their Arab identity.

While Walaa evoked a shared Arabness to imply a mutual ethnicity, it was also evoked in a shared sense of Arab nationalism through the term *Bilad al-Sham*., translated in English as Levant (the geographical region including present day Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine. Madha, a Syrian student at the HYC told me that all the girls at the center get along because "we are all *Bilad al Sham*, we are all one" (interview, April 12, 2017). Balqees, a Syrian student at the Rufayda Center shared this same idea:

> We're all one country. We're all *Bilad al Sham*, whether its Syrian or Jordan, Palestine or Lebanon. We're all one country. We're all here to learn. We all come to the same center and we are all one. (Interview, July 24, 2017)

By harkening a notion of pan-Arabism, the students evoked a shared identification and shared auto-biographical factors that generate belonging (Antonsich, 2010; Yuval-Davis, 2011).

Coming Together

Antonsich (2010) notes that a notion of belonging tied to a "rhetoric of sameness" can be problematic for its inability to recognize any difference and expectation of total assimilation "to the language, culture, values, behaviors and religion of the dominant group" (p. 650). While the notion of sameness between Jordanians and Syrians in FT constructed a shared sense of belonging, it also served to reproduce a dominant social ideology of what humanity, Islam and Arabism means. That is, embedded in the assertion that Syrians and Jordanians are all the same is the notion that they share a human experience, Muslim experience, and Arab experience. Yet, this discursive technique of inclusion also served to reproduce the dominant notion of what humanity means, and excludes those who do not fit into those three categories. That is, the notion of a similar human, Muslim, or Arab experience across Jordanians and Syrians denies the personal and institutional experiences of discrimination and marginalization felt by Syrian refugees in Jordan. It also points to the way that schools uphold and reproduce dominant cultural ideologies in ways that get taken up by all students (Apple, 2013).

This notion of sisterhood and sameness, understood through the lens of humanity, religion, and ethnicity, enabled Jordanian and Syrian students to imagine themselves as a

single unit, all tied to the same social fabric (Anthias, 2006). Within the confines of FT, they were all students with a common goal: to learn. As Miss Lamis stated: "I tell [the students] we are here for one reason: we are here to learn. No matter what your nationality is whether you are Syrian or Egyptian or Jordanian, you are here to learn" (interview, August 2, 2017). They shared imagined autobiographical experiences as Muslims who celebrate the same holidays, cultural connections as Arabs and speakers of the Arabic language, and ethical values of Islam (Antonsich, 2010; Yuval-Davis, 2011).

Exploring Belonging in FT

In addition to the primary FT NFE curriculum, the HYC offered its students the opportunity to participate in various workshops and electives. Some of them were short-term workshops, like the workshop I observed on "building social enterprises", and others were longer-term electives, like the photography elective led by the public relations coordinator. When the Director of Education at the HYC invited me to teach an elective, I welcomed the opportunity.

My elective class centered on cross-cultural communication and included lessons about diversity and culture, communication skills, and the English language. In order to practice the cross-cultural communication skills that students learned, we engaged in a virtual exchange project with an Arabic high school class in London. The elective, which met once a week for ten weeks, only included eight students, and did not have the pressure of grades. This made for a more informal and intimate environment where I could better understand the students, their relationships, and their interactions with each

other. Thus, teaching this class helped me to observe the processes of belonging and the politics of belonging at work.

The Students of the Elective Class

Eight girls self-selected to enroll in my class (see Table 5). They represented a diverse range of students, in terms of their national background and citizenship status, as well as other factors including their reasons for leaving school, their level of religiosity, their commitment to studying, their future aspirations, and so forth.

Figure 5: Students in HYC Elective Class

Name	**Background**
Amina	Iraqi, grew up in Syria
Dana	Syrian, lived with aunt in Hope House
Dina	Palestinian with Jordanian citizenship
Ghofran	Syrian, lived with mother in Hope House
Hayat	Egyptian, grew up in Jordan; mother in US
Jenan	Jordanian
Muna	Jordanian
Tala	Jordanian

Figure 5: Students in the FT Elective Class

Dana and Ghofran both lived at the Hope House, an apartment complex for Syrian widows and orphans[13] in Amman. Dana lived with her aunt and three young cousins; her mother had died in the war and her father remained in Syria. Ghofran's father died in the war and she lived with her mother and sisters in Jordan. Dana and Ghofran both lived in the Zaatari refugee camp prior to moving to the Hope House, where they had both been married and are now divorced. They were close friends and could frequently be seen together at HYC. Dana was boisterous, outgoing, and could

[13] In Islam, an orphan is an individual who has lost their father or husband.

always be spotted by her loud giggles and squeals. Ghofran was her opposite, reserved and pensive, preferring to listen and observe rather than speak.

Amina was born in Jordan to Iraqi parents but moved to Syria when she was young. When the war in Syria began, they moved to Iraq. Amina only lived in Iraq for one year before returning with her family to Jordan. Her parents recently divorced and her father returned to Iraq, where he remarried. She struggled with bouts of depression and anxiety, though one would never know this from the outside. She was mature and confident, and she was considered a star student at the HYC. The administration often selected her to represent the organization at local and national activities.

Jenan was a 15-year-old Jordanian student who came from an abusive household. She experienced physical and emotional abuse at the hands of her father and brothers, and had only a few months prior been able to move in with her mother. Despite having dropped out of school at a young age, she was incredibly motivated to finish high school and study in university. After her morning classes at the HYC, Jenan participated in extracurricular activities in the afternoon at another community center where she had already received certificates in computer literacy, jewelry making, drawing, and baking. She also attended lectures for youth at the University of Jordan one evening a week.

Hayat's parents hailed from Egypt, although Hayat spent her entire life in Jordan. Her mother lived in New Jersey and Hayat hoped to join her there some day. **Dina** was a Palestinian student with Jordanian nationality. She was kind and thoughtful, and she could often be found in the courtyard doodling in her notebook. Dina was an excellent artist and especially enjoyed creating drawings commenting on social and political events. **Muna** and **Tala** were also Jordanian students who were friends from

their level two class with Miss Amal. Tala took her studies very seriously and frequently took her textbooks home to continuing studying, although homework was not required by the HYC. Muna began coming to the HYC as a child, for a different program, and transitioned into the NFE program a year prior. She wore heavy makeup and seemed to always be texting on her cell phone.

Producing a Shared Sense of Belonging in the Elective Class

Dina had been standing guard at the door of our classroom and quickly ushered me in and shut the door. The remaining students had not even noticed me arrive as they were preoccupied trying on various parts of a clown costume they had found in the room. With Dina making sure that no men entered the room, the girls took turns trying on the oversized clown pants and removing their veils to put on a clown wig and top hat. They wrestled over the giant, sparkly sunglasses and laughed uncontrollably as the students continued to put on the various elements of the costume and pose for pictures. After a few minutes, I announced that we would be starting class, and the students begrudgingly removed the clown costume, put on their headscarves, and sat down.

In playing with a rogue clown costume, taking photos and making jokes, students illustrated their feeling of at-homeness, where home "stands for a symbolic space of familiarity, comfort, security, and emotional attachment" (Antonsich, 2010, p. 646). This was reinforced by taking on a shared social location (Yuval-Davis, 2006, 2011) as Muslim women, and asking Dina to guard the door to ensure that men did not enter and see them. In doing so, they were able to remove their headscarves in front of each other to try on the clown wig. Additionally, in donning the elements of the goofy costume and

taking photos in silly poses, they demonstrated a trust in each other and a willingness to show vulnerability.

We began preparations for our first virtual exchange with our sister class in London. Given the time difference, we conduct the exchange by recording and sending short videos. For their first set of videos, the students decided it was important to introduce themselves. In our rehearsal, Dana introduced herself (in Arabic) by saying, "Hi, I'm Dana. I'm 16 years old and I'm Syrian." Similarly, Jenan said, "Hello, I'm Jenan. I'm 15 years old and I'm Jordanian." After a few more practice introductions, Ghofran interrupted the rehearsal with an idea. She suggested that they introduce themselves by saying "I'm from Syria" or "I'm from Jordan," rather than saying "I'm Iraqi." She explained that by saying where they were from, they could still emphasize the fact that they all lived together in Jordan. They discussed the change briefly and decided it was a good idea. They wanted the kids in London to know that even though they were from different places, they were all friends in FT in Jordan.

Through this subtle change away from claiming national origin as the key marker of identity, the students refashioned the terms of belonging in the FT space and, in doing so, produced a sense of inclusion that tied together the students of varied national backgrounds. They moved away from a sense of belonging that focused on national identity to one that centered around the space they were in. Through the small linguistic change requested by Ghofran, they illustrated a sense that they were all part of the same "social fabric" (Anthias, 2006, p. 21). That is, rather than saying "I am Iraqi" and claiming Iraqi as a unique identity, the students agreed to say "I am from Iraq," allowing for the possibility of a shared identity as students, girls, and Muslims living in Jordan.

This small and nuanced shift enabled the students to highlight their national identities while maintaining a shared social location as students with an emotional attachment to the HYC. This shift allowed for a greater sense of inclusion for all students in the space.

The sense of belonging and its contribution to the production of inclusion was further evidenced in the students' preparation for the second video, where they described FT to the British students. Their rehearsal for this video led to a general conversation about their friendships. Jenan suggested they describe the HYC as a special center for students who had dropped out of school. She wanted to share with the British students that they had all struggled in public school for different reasons, but that they found a supportive community and learning environment at the HYC. Dina did not want to talk about their failures in public school, although they agreed it was important to emphasize that the HYC focused on supporting the students. Dana added that they should mention their friendships with each other and that the HYC was a special place where they got to see their friends. The discussion veered off topic as the eight girls talked about how much they loved coming to the center and getting to spend time together. Jenan reflected on their friendship, noting that she wished they could get together more outside the center. She lamented how lucky Dana and Ghofran were that they got to be together all day at the center, and also spend their afternoons and weekends together, since they live so close to each other. Dana similarly noted that she loved coming to the center and enjoyed getting to spend time with Jenan, Dina, and the other girls she met there. Eventually Dina, who was the videographer for this segment, wrangled the girls back on track to record the video.

In this vignette, the students showed a construction of shared belonging and inclusion around their enrollment in the NFE track and their previous challenges in public schools. This shared experience led them to build friendships with each other. The discussion they have about their friendships reinforces the sense of belonging they have cultivated in the center. In this way, the autobiographical factor (Antonsich, 2010) of belonging through their shared experience in FT outlined by Antonsich became a way that they constructed a culture of inclusion.

What also emerges from this vignette is one way that Syrian students draw on their transnational culture to actively cultivate a sense of inclusion for themselves. While it was clear that the Syrian and Jordanian students were friends with each other, the strong "social bonds" that many Syrian students had with each other also cultivated a greater sense of belonging in FT (Ager & Strang, 2008). Because Dana and Ghofran, for example, had a strong relationships outside of the center, cultivated through their shared experiences and close living situation, they came to the center with emotional attachments and a sense of belonging to each other, which helped them feel more comfortable at FT. In the anecdote above, Jenan acknowledged the friendship between the two Syrian students and expressed a desire to be a part of it, too. For Dana and Ghofran, it seemed that they could draw on their relationship with each other and other Syrian students as providing a foundational sense of at-homeness. They could maintain connections to their Syrian identities while constructing a shared sense of belonging with Jordanian students in the classroom.

The sense of belonging that was constructed by the students demonstrates a shared effort by Syrian and Jordanian students to construct and produce a shared culture

of inclusion. This can be seen in Dina's agreement to guard the door, thereby accepting the premise of their shared social location. Additionally, it is evidenced when Jenan expressed her disappointment in the physical distance between her home and Dana's home, resulting in limited (or no) social visits outside of school. She further demonstrated an acceptance of Dana as belonging in the community in her envy that Dana and Ghofran live close together. Jenan and Dana took action to remedy this by communicating over WhatsApp, an online messaging application. Through WhatsApp, Jenan and Dana were able to stay in touch even when Dana returned to Syria (in the summer of 2017).

Contesting Inclusion in the Classroom: The Politics of Belonging at Work

While Syrian and Jordanian students participated in an ongoing process of co-constructing a culture of inclusion in FT, it is a dynamic process that is constantly being built, negotiated, and contested in multiple ways. Although FT served as a site of the production of belonging and inclusion, there were also moments of rupture in that belonging. As I illustrate below, there were moments when the broad social norms and power dynamics of society played out in ways that gave Jordanians control as 'granters' of belonging (Spaaij, 2015). Similarly, FT was a site of struggle where Syrian students could contest, navigate, negotiate, and resist those norms, creating safe and welcoming spaces for themselves. Through this process, Syrian students constructed alternative means of belonging through transnational spaces, that began in FT but extended beyond the space of the school.

Language use and the politics of belonging. As I demonstrated earlier, the students in my elective class enjoyed each other's company and shared a sense of belonging in the space. They enjoyed spending time together and felt comfortable acting

silly and having fun. During one class session, we played a competitive game of charades to review some English vocabulary words they had learned. On Dana's turn, she picked a vocabulary word to act out to the group, and then began giggling in embarrassment. Dana began to act out her word but was met with the blank faces of her peers. After a few moments of awkward silence, Dana burst into laughter.

"Egg. I'm cracking an egg" she explained to them in Arabic, and the rest of the class joined her in laughter, gently teasing her for terrible acting skills. As the game devolved into a conversation between the girls, I turned to my bag to take out materials for the next activity. When I returned to the conversation between the students, they were discussing their different dialects. Arabic is a dialectical language and, although there is overlap between the dialects, each country (and region) has different words, accents, and terms. I frequently heard students discussing dialects, often comparing urban and rural accents, Palestinian and Jordanian phrases, and even the differences between male and female word choices.

In this case, the students were boisterously discussing words and accents across the different nationalities represented in the room, of which there were many. In her typical manner, Dana was loudly defending her Syrian word choices and accent, teasing her friends and giggling all the while. Dina proudly claimed her Palestinian accent, delighted at the opportunity to assert her national identity. Amina quietly noted the key differences in the Iraqi dialect, explaining that she preferred the Jordanian dialect, which is what she grew up with. Yet, I could see Tala, a Jordanian student, growing frustrated, and anxious to stop wasting time and return to the English lesson. Although all seven of my students expressed real interest in learning English, they also enjoyed the casual

environment and time to be with their friends, which I often provided. The conversation continued and Tala eventually lost her patience. “The Jordanian way is the right way to say it. Can we now return to our lesson?” she exclaimed loudly, her obstinacy shocking the girls into silence.

Tala’s assertion of the Jordanian way as the “right way” called into question the shared sense of belonging the girls experienced in the HYC. While the Syrian, Iraqi, and Palestinian students enjoyed the opportunity to compare their dialects and, in doing so, created a shared space that recognized their differences, opening the possibility for outside dialects was problematic to Tala. Thus, she ended the conversation by asserting the dominance of the Jordanian dialect. Through this “conditioning of speech” (Shirazi, 2018), Tala monitored how Syrian students (and those of other nationalities) could speak and, in doing so, reinforced Jordanian cultural and linguistic dominance in the classroom. In doing so, simultaneously drew attention to the fact that the presence of multiple accents and dialects are tolerated so long as they do not threaten the hegemony of the host’s way of speaking or being in their own home. Through this conversation around the varying dialects in the classroom, Tala saw her way of knowing and communicating—her language—threatened. As Yuval-Davis (2006) notes, “As a rule, the emotional components of people’s constructions of themselves and their identities become more central the more threatened and less secure they feel” (p. 202). Tala, feeling her Jordanian language threatened by the reminder that her Syrian (and Iraqi and Egyptian) peers speak another dialect of Arabic, asserted linguistic authority in the class and ended the conversation.

While Tala may have momentarily ruptured shared sense of belonging the students had cultivated, the fact that the conversation happened at all is noteworthy. The conversation around differences in dialect, points to a moment where Syrian refugee youth (and other students) embraced their differences to construct a new sense of belonging, one that perhaps went beyond notions of "sameness" and, instead, embraced the differences in their languages. Yet, as Giroux (2006) reminds us, resistance is an ongoing process in the face of oppression and domination (Giroux, 2006). In this case, Tala's discomfort provoked her need to assert her linguistic authority in the classroom.

Additionally, that it took an explicit conversation about dialects to remind Tala that the Syrian dialect is different from Jordanian points to another way that Syrian refugees constructed and navigated their belonging in FT. That is, they used the Jordanian dialect when they were speaking with Jordanians at the center. I observed this throughout my research and it was reinforced through multiple interviews, where Syrian students told me that they had learned "Jordanian Arabic"[14] and spoke that at the center. Although many Jordanians expressed delight in learning the Syrian dialect and hearing the Syrian accent, Syrians at FT typically spoke in a moderated dialect, incorporating Jordanian words and accents as possible. While they may have brought in a few Syrian words or drew on various aspects of their Syrian accent, Syrian students at FT told me that they tried to speak Jordanian Arabic as best they could. They also used their time at the center as an opportunity to build their Jordanian Arabic skills, which was useful for

[14] It is important to acknowledge that there are multiple variations of the Arabic dialect within Jordan. Yet, in my interviews and conversations with both Syrians and Jordanians, this fact was rarely acknowledged; rather, they viewed dialects as differing between nation-states.

them outside of the center, too. Their policing of their own language use indicates their awareness of these politics of belonging and a need to mediate the way they speak in order to be accepted.

While speech was conditioned and monitored in particular ways that compelled Syrian refugee youth to speak the Jordanian dialect in class, that's not the whole story. In my conversations with Dana and Ghofran and other Syrian students at FT, they framed their use of the Jordanian dialect as a sign of their power, not weakness. They maintained that they used the Jordanian dialect because if they spoke in the Syrian one, their Jordanian peers would not understand them. Thus, they reclaimed control by choosing to speak the Jordanian dialect over the Syrian one. Acknowledging the power embedded in their Syrian dialect reinforced their membership to a transnational Syrian community and the exclusion of the Jordanians from that mode of belonging. This builds on the work of Yuval-Davis (2011) in pointing to the multiple forms of belonging that exist across national boundaries.

The transnational belonging Syrian refugee students maintained to a broader Syrian community was further evident through their continued use of the Syrian dialect when they were just amongst themselves at FT. I had several private conversations with Dana and Ghofran where they tried to teach me the Syrian dialect, asserting that it was more beautiful than the Jordanian dialect. Dana even added me to a Facebook group of her Syrian friends so that I could learn the dialect. Thus, while they disciplined themselves to speak the Jordanian dialect with their Jordanian peers as a way to build a sense of belonging around shared language, they did not fully bend to the linguistic dominance of the Jordanian dialect. Rather, they maintained a sense of membership to a

broad Syrian community beyond FT, adding a transnational component to the notion of belonging. Thus, while Yuval-Davis, Anthias and Kofman (2005) assert that belonging entails loyalty to the state, the transnational connections the Syrian refugees forge, point to other possibilities of belonging.

Expressing gratitude and the politics of belonging. In preparation for another video exchange with our sister class in London, I asked the students to consider what they knew about life in London, what they wanted to learn about life in London, and what they wanted the British students to know about their lives in Jordan. As the conversation evolved, and they discussed some of the differences they imagined between life in London and life in Jordan, they began to discuss the diversity of life within Jordan and across the Arab world. Jenan noted that even though they consider all Arabs to have a shared culture, people in Jordan eat different foods than people in Saudi Arabia or Morocco. Ghofran observed that within Jordan, people also spoke different dialects of Arabic, which varied between Syrians and Jordanians, but also within the national populations and urban/rural regions of the country.

As the conversation turned towards the diversity within the Arab world, Dana and Ghofran began to talk about the differences they saw and felt between Syria and Jordan. They talked about the difference in schooling explaining that in Syria they had mixed-gender education unlike Jordan, where boys and girls were segregated in different schools. They also explained that the schools in Syria looked different: according to Ghofran, the schools in Syria were much bigger and more beautiful. This intrigued some of the students and they pressed Dana and Ghofran for more details about their schools. Dana added that all of Syria was beautiful, more so than Jordan. She lamented the brown

of the Jordanian desert and the lack of trees in the urban areas of the country, explaining in comparison that the Syrian landscape was covered by lush greenery, with beautiful flowers and trees everywhere. She described one area near where she lived where, in the springtime, flowers bloomed and trees blossomed so greatly that you could not even see the ground. The other students asked for more information, provoking Ghofran to draw a picture of her neighborhood in Syria, pointing to the natural beauty which also included multiple rivers, creeks, and streams that they would walk through and sit by. In this small way, Dana and Ghofran were able to negotiate the broad notion of sameness and show their friends some of their differences. In doing so, they contributed to a culture of inclusion that afforded Dana and Ghofran the right to be different as well as the ability to express longing for their home country.

Yet, not all students embraced this new form of inclusion that enabled Dana and Ghofran to embrace their differences. As they spoke, I saw Jenan grow tense. She had, at other times, shared with me her frustration around Dana's occasional comments about Jordan's lack of natural beauty. Although other students seemed engaged by the conversation and interested in the differences between Syria and Jordan, Jenan seemed to grow distant and irritated. When there was a pause in the conversation, Jenan noted that she thought Jordan was beautiful and that perhaps Dana and Ghofran should stop insulting the country that welcomed them from war and gave them a safe place to live. Tala nodded in agreement, adding that they should be grateful for what they have in Jordan. Dana and Ghofran grew quiet and, after a momentary pause, affirmed that they were very happy to be living in Jordan and attending school at FT.

In this vignette, Dana and Ghofran reminded their classmates of their difference in a way that was considered "ungrateful" by some of their peers. Their longing and nostalgia for Syria seemed to indicate to some a lack of appreciation or even disdain towards Jordan. Through the politics of belonging, Jenan and Tala constructed a boundary of belonging which excluded the Syrian refugee youth (Yuval-Davis, 2011). It was not uncommon to hear this sentiment from Jordanians and it came through clearly in my interview with Jenan. She expressed feeling irritated when Dana contrasted the beauty of Syria with the concrete desert of Amman and its dry and dusty atmosphere. Jenan told me:

> [Syrians] say, our country, Jordan, is not nice. Your schools are, I don't know, not good. And I tell them, yeah, that's how it is. That's what you have and you should accept it… I don't like this from them. They live here, why would they say that? There are countries that didn't accept Syrians, but Jordan has accepted everyone. We never refused anyone. I don't like getting into politics, I don't care about it, but…if we live together and you drink from the water of my country, you shouldn't say anything bad about it. You shouldn't say anything bad about Jordan. We accepted you across our borders, we didn't shoot you at the borders. So you should respect this. (Interview, July 23, 2017)

Jenan emphasized Jordan's virtuous act of accepting refugees (and not shooting them), but clearly expected that the Syrians would be grateful not only for this acceptance, but for everything in Jordan. Other Jordanian students at the HYC expressed this expectation of gratitude for the benevolent act Jordanians did in allowing Syrians into their country. For the Jordanians, then, seeking belonging entailed an expression of gratitude towards

Jordanians and a demonstration of unconditional appreciation for the country and what is in it. If belonging is about an emotional attachment to a place, Dana and Ghofran were clearly showing their continued attachment to Syria, rendering them—in the eyes of Jordanians—unattached and, therefore, ungrateful to Jordan. This, in the hands of the granters, denied Syrians belonging in the FT class.

By comparing Syria to Jordan, where they extolled the strengths of Syria, they also implicitly insulted Jordan. Doing so went against the normative expectation that, in exchange for security and protection in Jordan, Syrian refugees would show gratitude. As Shirazi (2018) writes, "The gift of hospitality is accompanied by the hosts' expectation of gratitude and affirmation of their own benevolence" (p. 112). Yet, by reminiscing about the life in Syria, Dana and Ghofran students were neither showing gratitude nor affirming the benevolence of Jordanians. This lack of gratitude caused a rupture in Jenan's willingness to grant them belonging. She subtly reminded them of the conditionality of their belonging, resulting in a quick apology and, perhaps, a return to a shared belonging that affirms the ownership or domicile of the host. As in the example above, where Tala insisted on the dominance of the Jordanian dialect, this example points to the conditioning of speech for refugee students as the way to mediate and foster belonging (Shirazi, 2018).

In her chapter on Palestinian refugees, Moulin (2012) identifies the power dynamics embedded in the gift-giving logic, where the state gives security and protection and expects gratitude and benevolence in exchange. This expectation, she argues, places refugees in "a condition of subordination and dependency," where the refugee is expected to be subservient to the generosity of their hosts. If notions of belonging are intertwined

in this exchange, where the Jordanian hosts also have the power to grant belonging, this incident gave Jenan an opportunity to remind Dana and Ghofran of their place in the hierarchical system and the expectation that they will obey certain rules (Freier, 2015). By not showing their gratitude, the Syrian students threatened the process of reciprocity, the social hierarchy emerged, and allowed for Jenan to momentarily rupture the granting of belonging.

These two examples point to a tension between inclusion as friendship and social connections and a deeper sense of belonging, which is granted and negotiated through symbolic power and held by those with hegemonic dominance (Yuval-Davis, 2011). Jenan and Tala were able to maintain their friendships with Dana and Ghofran and, indeed, Jenan expressed desire to spend more time with her Syrian friends. And yet, their status as refugees and non-Jordanians always rendered them slightly outside the realm of belonging.

Transnational Belonging: Belonging beyond FT, Belonging beyond Boundaries

Dana and Ghofran's continued longing and nostalgia for Syria, like the ways they continued to use their dialect and speak about their lives in Syria, also points to ways that they maintained transnational membership to a Syrian community within and beyond FT. This builds on the work of Abu el Haj (2016) who pointed to the many ways that Palestinian youth in America constructed belonging across transnational social fields. I had many private conversations with Dana and Ghofran where they told me about Syria and their lives there. Indeed, it was not uncommon to find groups of Syrian students

together in the courtyard. In an interview with Fotouh and Sawsan, two Syrian students at the HYC, explained it to me like this:

> Sawsan: It's different when we are with just Syrians
>
> Fotouh: When we are with the other Syrian students, we feel like we are with our family. We get together and it feels more comfortable
>
> Sawsan: We left Syria so this environment of being with only Syrians is not common. It's valuable to us. I feel like our stories and what we talk about is different
>
> Fotouh: We all had the same experience, we're all outside of our country, this is the closest with can get to our country
>
> Sawsan: The conversations we have and the stuff we talk about is different than what we talk about with the other students. (Interview, April 19, 2017)

In addition to Syrian students within FT making spaces for themselves to reminisce about Syria and share their experiences together, they maintained relationships with their Syrian friends outside of FT and beyond the national boundaries of Jordan through social networks like Facebook and WhatsApp. Dana, for example, was incredibly active on Facebook in multiple groups that helped her build and maintain relationships with Syrians who had been displaced and relocated all around the world. Through WhatsApp she was also able to communicate with family members still in Syria and in other refugee-hosting countries. In this way, she was still able to feel a sense of belonging to a Syrian national collective while living in Jordan. This points to ways that Syrian refugee youth in the inclusive refugee education context of Jordan construct an affective sense of belonging in the local context drawing on shared social positions as Muslims and

Arabs, but also maintain a sense of national belonging across national boundaries (Abu el Haj, 2016). Thus, the construction and contestation of belonging was not a one-way process, imposed upon Syrian refugee youth; rather, they actively engaged in cultivating multiple spaces of belonging through relationships online and over the phone as well as through small group discussions at school and gatherings at home.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have shown the dynamic contours of belonging and the multiple ways that it is constructed and reconstructed, navigated, and negotiated by both Syrian refugee students and Jordanian students. I demonstrated how students draw on the notion of sameness and sisterhood to construct a shared sense of belonging and emotional attachment to each other and the space of FT. This sense of sameness and belonging ties students to shared social locations (Yuval-Davis, 2011) as Muslims and Arabs and the related autobiographical and cultural factors that connect them (Antonsich, 2010).

While sameness can cultivate a shared sense of belonging among Syrians and Jordanians through membership in similar social locations, it can also be threatened by national politics of belonging which lead Jordanians to interrogate and, perhaps, limit their granting of belonging. Through threats to sameness were rare, they did occur. Threats to sameness arose in my class when linguistic differences became apparent and when Syrian refugees actively reminded students not only of their Syrian origins, but of their preference for Syria. These threats to the sameness of Syrians and Jordanians, through linguistic differences and national loyalties—as well as other differences that arose such as financial status, employability, and other factors—frequently caused

Jordanians to limit their acceptance towards Syrians and, ultimately, the Syrian sense of belonging in Jordan.

I also demonstrated ways that Syrians negotiated these ruptures by constructing and maintaining alternative belongings to a transnational Syrian community. They did so by continuing to use their dialect and speaking about and longing for Syria. They also maintained friendships with other Syrians as a foundation of belonging to a transnational community that was physically located, in part, in FT. Drawing on their "social bonds…enabled them to share cultural practices and maintain familiar patterns of relationships" (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 178). This was reinforced by Fotouh and Sawsan, who said that, while they like their Jordanian friends, but sometimes "it's more comfortable" with their Syrian friends. Fotouh explained that "We all had the same experience, we are outside of our country, this is the closest we can get to home." Having the community of Syrians in the center served as a resource to build a greater sense of belonging in the space. This points to the importance of the transnational relationships and extends Yuval-Davis' (2011) concept of belonging beyond national boundaries. Syrian refugee build and maintain with each other—both in the classroom space and beyond. Those connections enable them to maintain a sense of belonging to multiple places.

Using the framework of belonging, then, provides a more nuanced understanding of what inclusion in refugee education looks like and complicates an understanding of inclusion as broad social connections and social cohesion. Unlike the frameworks that assess integration through the achievement of particular outcomes (Ager & Strang, 2008), inclusion is a dynamic process that is ongoing and also extends beyond national

boundaries (for the Syrian population). It is actively constructed, navigated, and negotiated by both Syrian refugees and Jordanian students. In this case, they drew on discursive techniques of sameness to build belonging. Jordanian students as representatives of the social status quo still held power to challenge or question inclusion, particularly through the conditioning of speech (Shirazi, 2018) and limiting what Syrians could say and how. Yet, Syrians also played active roles in maneuvering this conditioning through alternative spaces where they could freely use their dialect, reflect on their experiences, and demonstrate nostalgia for Syria.

Chapter Six: Engaging the Curriculum

Miss Sawsan and I sat in the teachers' lounge of the HYC. As we ate our lunches, I asked her about the FT curriculum. She told me that it includes four primary subjects: Arabic, math, English and computers, but that embedded in Arabic is what FT calls the 'Integrated Curriculum,' which includes five subjects: science, religion, vocational preparation, Arabic language and literacy, and civics/social studies. I asked her more about the content of the civics and social studies units. She explained:

> *The students learn about Jordan, the capital of the country, and the different governorates…The students should know the borders of the Hashemite Kingdom…They need to know that Amman is the capital. They should know the name of the King, that Jordan is a kingdom, the money of the country, what Jordan produces, what we export and import, how we deal with other countries, what raw materials we have that can be produced into other things or do we get it from other countries. They should know about the country, where they live, what's in the north and what's in the south.*

I asked Miss Sawsan how the Syrian students responded to these lessons on Jordan and if they felt excluded at all. She told me that she tries to be inclusive in her lessons and that when she teaches about Jordan, she also talks about other countries in the region, including Syria. Although the textbook only has maps of Jordan, she told me that last time she taught this lesson, she pulled up maps of Syria, Lebanon and Egypt on the classroom computer to show students the geography and major cities of the entire region. But, she added, while she makes an effort to include the broader Middle East region, it is

important for Jordanian citizens to learn about their rights and responsibilities in Jordan.

In this short conversation, Miss Sawsan gave a small example of how she extended the official FT curriculum to include the experiences and backgrounds of her Syrian students in a social studies lesson. By official curriculum, I refer to the learning objectives, content, and materials designed and approved by FT in collaboration with the MoE (Guo & Maitra, 2017). In this chapter, I examine the relationship between curriculum and inclusion in the context of inclusive refugee education and the ways in which students and teachers engage with the curriculum. I answer the questions: How does the formal curriculum shape possibilities of inclusion/exclusion? How do students and teachers engage with the curriculum in response to this inclusion/exclusion? How does curricular engagement give new meanings to inclusive refugee education?

I argue that while the formal curriculum limits the possibilities of inclusion for Syrian refugee youth, students and teachers engage with the curriculum through four mechanisms that both challenge and expand a curriculum predominantly absent of refugees and their experiences. These mechanisms include: extension of the curriculum, leadership in the curriculum, uncertainty and curricular engagement, and refusal and withdrawal from the curriculum. Through these mechanisms, refugee youth assert agency to construct spaces of inclusion, thereby giving new cultural meaning to inclusive refugee education. I contend that it is the structure of FT as a non-formal education program that makes it possible for students to challenge and extend the curriculum and assert their agency. To support this argument, first I introduce a critical framework for analyzing curriculum. Second, I provide a brief analysis of the FT curriculum,

highlighting key themes of the curriculum and analyzing ways that the curriculum is seen as inclusive and exclusion. Third, I draw on ethnographic data to illustrate four key mechanisms students and teachers use to engage with the curriculum and construct new cultural meanings.

This chapter builds on and extends the work of others who have studied education in the Middle East and documented the efforts of Jordanian schooling to shape a loyal national subject (Adely 2012a; Anderson, 2005; Kubow, 2010; Shirazi, 2012). They have also pointed to the ways that these three curricular themes, Islam, nationalism, and employment, get taken up in educational policy (Kubow, 2010) and are navigated and negotiated by students (Adely 2012a, Shirazi, 2012). This chapter extends this work in two ways. First, my analysis looks specifically at the ways in which refugee youth engage with these themes. Second, I focus my analysis on textbooks and ways in which students engage specifically with curricular material.

This chapter also makes contributions to our understanding of the role of curriculum in refugee education. Debates regarding the curriculum of refugee education have centered on whether to use the curriculum of the refugee home country or host country (Dryden-Peterson, 2016; Walters & LeBlanc,2005). The recent move towards inclusive refugee education has prioritized the use of the host country curriculum. Despite the benefits of doing so, including the opportunity for refugee students to receive certified education, Dryden-Peterson (2015a, 2015b) has argued that refugee students face multiple challenges using the host country curriculum, which is often difficult for refugee students to relate to and, in some cases, highly politicized or discriminatory. These challenges include language barriers, a clear demonstration of social power

structures, and a lack of relevancy to the refugee students' lived realities (Dryden-Peterson, 2015a, 2015b). My curricular analysis similarly shows a demonstration of social power structures and the specific ways in which the curriculum excludes refugees. I extend the conversation around curriculum in contexts of inclusive refugee education by examining and highlighting ways that refugee students engage with the curriculum and make meaning out of their educational experiences.

A Critical Framework for Analyzing Curriculum

Apple (1993) asserts that the curriculum is not a neutral collection of knowledge that is disseminated to students. Instead, it is a purposeful selection of ideas that seek to legitimate and reproduce dominant social, political, and economic ideologies through schooling. One important element of official curriculum, that is, the curriculum as it is prescribed by the state, is the way in which it produces knowledge of the dominant social groups and subjects that reinforce the hegemonic cultural forms of those dominant groups (Meshulam & Apple, 2009). In doing so, the curriculum seeks to shape students into particular types of citizens and legitimize certain ways of knowing and understanding the world. In this way, curriculum holds power in the school in the way in which it selectively presents knowledge as legitimate and dominant (Apple, 2013). As Kubow (2010) observed in her study of school reform in Jordan, schools are "sites where official versions of Jordanian identity are taught and reinforced" (p. 7), and these versions come largely from the curriculum. In Jordan, schooling aims to produce youth who will be "enterprising, moderate, and empowered" (Shirazi, 2012, p. 71), who will demonstrate

religiosity through adherence to cultural norms, and who will strive to contribute to Jordan's development and prosperity (Adely, 2012a).

While school curricula may seek to reproduce dominant cultural ideologies, they are not merely sites of reproduction. Rather, schools are sites of struggle through which students and teachers participate in the production of alternative forms of culture. Giroux (1983) offers a way to understand reproductive efforts of curriculum alongside the contestation and resistance of both students and teachers. Giroux contends that engagement with the curriculum on the parts of the students and teachers is a social process through which "different social groups both accept and reject the complex mediations of culture, knowledge, and power that give form and meaning to the process of schooling" (p. 62). Through this process, students build on their own lived experiences to engage with the curriculum and make it meaningful to them. Thus, examining curricular engagement entails an analysis of the ways that students and teachers embrace, contest, reject, and resist the official curriculum and, in doing so, produce new cultural forms.

An Analysis of the FT Curriculum

As I explained in Chapter Four, and Miss Sawsan noted in the opening vignette in this chapter, the FT curriculum is a two year accelerated learning program where students complete grades one through ten. The program consists of three levels which approximately correspond to grades one through five, six through eight, and nine and ten. Although students are required to pass an exam written by FT and the MoE to move from one level to the next, the exams are not as stringent as the public school. Additionally, the

curricular content focuses on four main subjects only: Arabic, math, English, and computers. There is a strong emphasis on developing basic literacy and numeracy schools and building vocational and entrepreneurial skills. Similarly, the day to day learning is not as strict and structured as it is in the public school and students face much less pressure as they do not receive grades or homework in FT. Additionally, teachers do not rely solely on a teacher-centered style of teaching and learning; rather, they fluctuate between teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches in the classroom. Through the use of activities and in-class discussions as well as efforts to relate learning to students' lives, FT cultivates an environment where students are respected and, as a result, comfortable engaging in the classroom. Thus, the narrower curriculum, lower levels of pressure, and engaged learning process contributes to a relaxed environment where students have opportunities to contribute to the classroom

Within the Arabic curriculum, students learn religion, civics, social studies, and Islam through what is called the Integrated Curriculum. The Integrated Curriculum is made up of religion, vocation, social studies, and citizenship (Ministry of Education, 2004). It includes 16 units spread over two textbooks, which are used across the three levels of FT[15] (see Appendix 1). As a full curricular analysis is beyond the scope of this dissertation, I provide here an analysis of the two textbooks of the Integrated Curriculum. I selected these textbooks for three reasons. First, as a conglomeration of the primary subjects studied at FT (with the exception of mathematics, which students studied from a different textbook), it is broadly representative of the official curriculum overall. Second,

[15] As I discussed in Chapter One, the FT system includes three levels that students move through over the course of 24 months in the program.

the lessons I observed in action came predominantly from this curriculum. Third, it is within these textbooks that lessons on social studies and citizenship education are found—these subjects are most likely to raise questions of inclusion and exclusion for Syrian refugees and, thus, of most interest to this study.

Through my analysis of the two Integrated Curriculum textbooks, I have identified three themes that work together to help shape parameters of inclusion and exclusion for FT students: Islam, Jordanian citizenship nationalism, and employment. I show that the lessons around Islam emphasize Muslim unity and reinforce the inclusive discourse of "we're all brothers" that exists within FT. The lessons on Jordanian citizenship and nationalism emphasize the importance of connection to Jordan and attempts to instill a sense of patriotism, which can be exclusive of Syrian refugee youth who may not feel such a connection. Finally, the theme of employment emphasizes work as a contribution to the development of Jordan. While each theme can be seen independently as creating possibilities for inclusion or exclusion, taken together they create a complex and nuanced picture of who is included and who is not. The emphasis on Muslim unity includes Muslim refugees in the community, yet they are left out of the community as non-citizens, and maintain an ambiguous relationship to employment given the limitations on formal employment and the proliferation of informal employment. Thus, it becomes important to understand how Syrian refugee youth engage with and enact these curricular ideas.

It is important to note that the textbooks used in FT were published in 2004, well before the recent influx of Syrian refugee and even before the influx of Iraqi refugees in 2006. Perhaps it should not be expected that the textbooks would address issues of forced

migration that are prevalent in society today. Yet, during the time of my research, these textbooks were in use in FT as part of the formal curriculum distributed by the MoE. Therefore, while I am not trying to read an anachronistic text from 2004 solely through the contemporary political and social situation, I will focus on how it is read by students and teachers today.

Islam in the Curriculum: "Muslims are All Brothers in Religion"

The religion of Islam is featured prominently across the textbooks I analyzed, asserting a sense of unity among (Sunni) Muslims across nation-states. The curriculum establishes the importance of adhering to Sunni Islam as a central mechanism for fostering inclusion among students (Adely, 2012b). Additionally, it serves to legitimize the Hashemite monarchy in Jordan by connecting it to the Prophet Mohammed (Anderson, 2001). As Adely (2012b) further explains, "The [Jordanian] textbooks are meant to impart orthodoxy, the accepted account of proper faith" (p. 307). I argue that the curriculum explicitly and implicitly asserts the unity of Muslims, thereby reinforcing a sense of inclusion for those with a Muslim identity and supporting the discourse of "we're all sisters" that circulates across FT.

The Integrated Curriculum textbooks include various lessons on the unity of all Muslims across national borders. In the first unit of the textbook, the textbook outlines how to treat people well, with a focus on interactions between Muslims. For example, in the unit called Treatment of Others, the textbook states: "Muslims are all brothers in religion, even if their colors, countries, and languages differ. They believe in one God and pray in the same direction" (Ministry of Education, 2004a, p. 45). That is, regardless of differing backgrounds, their religious affiliation unites them together. Another lesson

draws on a verse from a Quran explaining that God commanded Muslims to treat their neighbors well. The textbook outlines a hierarchy of which neighbors to treat well, placing neighbors who are Muslim and relatives at the top, neighbors who are Muslim but not related in the middle, and neighbors who are not Muslim at the bottom. Through this hierarchy, the textbook emphasizes a sense of communal responsibility towards Muslims over non-Muslims. This can be read as a responsibility to help and support Muslim refugees.

The textbooks reinforce the centrality of Islam to life in Jordan and a sense of unity among Muslims. In addition to lessons and units explicitly about Islam, secular subjects are taught with verses from the Quran and Hadith, too. For example, the unit about careers includes a lesson about trustworthiness at work. The lesson begins with a story about the Prophet Mohammad who worked as a shepherd. Khadija "heard of his trustworthiness" and hired him to work for her in trade (2004a, p. 202). The story explains that "he was sincere in his work, and made her business a great profit, which made her respect him, love him, and agree to marry him" (p. 202). Thus, a lesson about the value of honesty at work is tied to Islam. The predominance of Islam in the textbooks, and throughout the curriculum at large, creates discursive opportunities for inclusion for all Muslim students—whether they are from Jordan, Syria, or elsewhere in the Muslim diaspora. The subject of Islam is, in theory, a topic that all students can relate to in some way and, therefore, creates openings for inclusion and participation. However, in the classes I observed, this was not always the case. Notably, the tension between the narrative of "we are all sisters" upheld in part by this assumed community through Islam lies in contrast with the exclusion of national belonging that Syrian refugees experience

and that I explored in the previous chapter. This can also be seen in the next section which explores the theme of Jordanian citizenship and nationalism in the curriculum.

Jordanian Citizenship and Nationalism in the Curriculum: "I Love You, My Country"

A second theme of the curriculum that shapes parameters of inclusion is Jordanian citizenship and nationalism. My analysis aligns with Kubow and Kreishan (2014) who assert that Jordanian school curriculum gives little attention to issues of forced migration. I extend this argument by showing how this limited attention creates possibilities for greater exclusion of Syrian refugees in curricular enactment.[16]

The first way that the textbooks open possibilities to exclude Syrian refugees is through its use of possessive language. That is, the textbooks make frequent reference to the country of Jordan as "your country," "my country," or "my nation." For example, a lesson about Jordanian geography shows a map of the country and asks students to answer questions including, "Identify *your* city's name on the map" and "what is the sea that is in *your* country" (Ministry of Education, 2004a, p. 147, emphasis added). There is a lesson about Amman that is called "My Nation's Capital" and a lesson about the country entitled "I Love You, My Nation." The use of possessive pronouns asserts that the reader should have a possessive connection to the country of Jordan. This focus on the personal and/or historical connections to specific Jordanian localities potentially excludes many refugees and other non-citizens who may not feel that Jordan is 'their country.'

[16] The curriculum also complicates belonging for many Palestinian refugees who hold Jordanian citizenship, but feel strong ties to Palestine. For more on this, see Shirazi, 2012

Second, the textbooks focus on the role of the state in serving and protecting its citizens. In doing so, the textbooks conceal the presence of non-citizens in the country. They define citizen as "a person who lives in a country and holds its nationality" (2004b, p. 76), thereby leaving non-Jordanians out of the definition. The textbook asserts that the state functions to "provide services *to citizens* such as education, health care, water, electricity, construction of factories, protection of individual freedoms, and ensuring internal stability by maintaining security" (Ministry of Education, 2004b, p. 76, emphasis added). Specifying that these services are for citizens inherently leaves out non-citizens. There is no mention of ways that non-citizens, such as refugees, might access public services from health and safety institutions in Jordan. The textbook also outlines the role of the government in protecting the individual rights of its citizens. The textbook states:

> Every Jordanian citizen has rights and liberties that must be respected and protected by the government. The Jordanian Constitution stipulates that all Jordanian citizens are equal in rights, without discrimination, even if their origins, race, religion, wealth or responsibilities differ. (2004b, p. 80)

Although the above quote allows for flexibility of origin, race, and religion, it clearly stipulates that only citizens have these rights and responsibilities. While the textbook includes lengthy discussions of various laws that protect rights of Jordanian citizens, it makes no mention of the non-citizens living in the country and what rights or protections are available to them. These lessons, then, may be viewed as irrelevant or exclusive by Syrian refugee youth in the classroom.

Finally, throughout the curriculum, the nation is intertwined with religion, drawing on Islam to legitimize the nation and, therefore, the importance of a Jordanian

national identity. This aligns with the work of others who have argued that through the work that textbooks do to connect Islam to national symbols and ideas, "obedience to the state is fostered" (Kubow, 2010, p. 14). This connection can be seen, for example, in a lesson on good citizenship that notes that citizens have a responsibility to the state to uphold Islamic values and that "these morals and attitudes should be practiced as a way of life" (Ministry of Education, 2004b, p. 81). Another instance of the connection between the nation and Islam is a lesson that claims that the state's defense institutions and fighters protect the nation and guard the borders out of fear of and obedience to God. In this way, loyalty and obedience to God legitimizes the actions of the Jordanian Armed Forces and their efforts to protect the nation, potentially including Jordan's intervention in the Syrian Civil War and Jordan's border policies towards Syrian refugees. Thus, the connection between citizenship and religion poses a tension for many Muslim refugee youth who, on the one hand, may feel a loyalty to Islamic values and lessons, yet may not feel a loyalty to the state of Jordan and may, in fact, hold resentment towards their military actions or border policies.

"Work is a Means of Contributing to Society": Neoliberal Parameters of Inclusion and Exclusion

A third prominent theme in the curriculum is the strong value placed on employment. Indeed, as Shirazi (2010, 2012, 2015) and Hantzopoulos and Shirazi (2014) have illustrated, education reform in Jordan has been based on a neoliberal agenda that ascribes to human capital theory, positioned as an effort to build a knowledge economy that will develop human capital and contribute to economic growth. Hantzopoulos and Shirazi (2014) have connected this neoliberal agenda with nationalism, arguing that

"youth [in Jordan] are incited to become national assets for future prosperity, in a shared project of nation building" (p. 378). As I illustrate below, this neoliberal emphasis is illustrated in the curriculum in the ways it upholds the importance of obtaining and valuing employment. I argue that this element of the curriculum also has potential to exclude refugees in light of the complexities around the employment of refugees in Jordan.

The FT Integrated Curriculum stresses the importance of employment through a host of units and activities that discuss careers and build skills to potentially contribute to income-generation. The Integrated Curriculum textbooks include a unit on careers, a unit on work and workers, and a unit on developing small business. By virtue of having these units on employment, combined with extra-curricular activities and workshops about professional skills, the curriculum sends a message that working is an essential aspect of their future. Indeed, as a part of the state's neoliberal reforms, it is withdrawing from the public sector and, instead, investing in building a strong 'knowledge economy' to produce human capital that will contribute to private sector-led economic growth (Hantzopoulos & Shirazi, 2014). Thus, the state is sending a strong message that employment and labor market participation is essential for a successful future in Jordan.

In order to encourage participation in the labor market, the textbooks emphasize the value of work through its glorification, i.e., not only the importance of working, but of loving work. The first lesson in the unit on work and workers is entitled "Love of Work" and begins as follows: "Workers love their job because it makes them feel alive and useful to society, and it allows them to obtain what they need in their lives" (Ministry

of Education, 2004a, p. 223). In a lesson on honorable/lawful (*halal*) earnings, students are instructed to fill in the blanks below. I have indicated the correct answer in bold:

1. The most honorable earning is the earning a man makes _____ (asleep, **with his hands**)
2. The working person is _____ than the unemployed person (worse, **better**)
3. We _____ with our hands (become lazy, **work**). (2004a, p. 204)

This activity stresses not only that work is important, but it also sends an explicit message that those who do not work are lazy and inferior. Yet, for Syrian refugees, opportunities to work in Jordan are complex. As I discussed in Chapter One, they are only allowed to work legally in a limited number of sectors. Many do work informally, but they often accept jobs with poor working conditions, low wages, and other conditions that make working difficult. Thus, the emphasis on valuing work may be received with mixed perspectives by Syrian refugees.

The value of work is further emphasized by connecting work to Islam, once again revealing a tension between the various subject positions constructed by the textbook. While the subject position of employee or worker is often fraught for Syrians, the subject position of Muslim may be less so. The textbook asserts that "Islam ties work with worship and urges Muslims to work in many sectors, such as agriculture, trade, etc." (Ministry of Education, 2004b, p. 161). In a lesson about the religious values of honesty (*sadaq*) and sincerity (*ikhlas*), the definition of honesty is reinforced by an example of how an honest merchant discusses the advantages and disadvantages of his goods with his customers. In this way, the textbook ties the values of Islam directly to the actions of

a worker, pointing to their interconnection. By connecting work to religion, the curriculum legitimizes employment as an essential aspect of life in Jordan.

As these three themes have shown, the official ideology inscribed in the textbooks puts forth the values of a unified Muslim community, a patriotic love of Jordan, and a desire to work towards the country's development. These three themes are reinforced by a range of activities and events held by FT, including Jordanian Independence Day celebrations, communal Ramadan breakfasts, and workshops to design small businesses. I argue that although the theme of Islam may create an opportunity to include Syrian refugees in the narrative, the themes of nationalism and employment have potential to exclude Syrians. Moreover, the intertwined nature of the three themes constructs a tension between inclusion and exclusion. In the next section, I draw on my ethnographic observations and interviews to illustrate how students (and, to a lesser extent, teachers) engaged with the curriculum in ways that complicated and, at times, contradicted the official messages of inclusion and exclusion found within the pages of these textbooks.

Expanding Inclusion and Navigating Exclusion: Mechanisms of Curricular Engagement

While the official curriculum imposes a particular perspective and set of ideologies, schools are not merely reproductive; they are sites of struggle where students (and teachers) participate in the production of new knowledges and cultures (Kincheloe & McClaren, 2002; Levinson et al., 1996). In FT, students and teachers engaged with the curriculum and responded to potentially exclusive messages through four different mechanisms: extension, leadership, uncertainty, and refusal. I argue that these multiple

responses to the curriculum were possible because of the non-formal environment and the emphasis on student-centered learning in the classrooms. This environment allowed for Syrian refugee students to creatively engage with the curriculum in ways that afforded them greater agency and opportunities for inclusion

Extension as a Means of Curricular Engagement

The first mechanism through which students (and teachers) engaged with the curriculum was the extension of the curriculum. Students and teachers demonstrated flexibility to extend the lessons beyond what was in the formal curriculum. This happened in ways that made space for Syrian refugees and other non-Jordanian students. Syrian refugee students inserted themselves and their lived experiences into the lessons by making comparisons to life in Syria or sharing their experiences as refugees, thereby expanding the lessons to include them. While I did not see instances of teachers initiating this extension, because of FT's emphasis on student-centered learning which I discussed in Chapter Four, they created an environment that permitted this extension and, at times, enabled them to participate in extending the curriculum. That is, the teachers provided ample opportunities for students to contribute to in class discussions and bring in their own experiences, which Syrian students occasionally did by talking about Syria. This is not to say that teachers necessarily strayed dramatically from the formal curriculum and what was prescribed in the textbooks, but by showing flexibility, they demonstrated willingness to include Syrians in a broader narrative.

I saw many instances of refugee students extending the curriculum to include their perspectives and experiences. For example, during a lesson on social problems in Jordan, the teacher focused her discussion on those social problems listed in the textbook,

including “family disintegration and divorce, bad friends, unemployment, disputes between siblings, social isolation, cruelty and aggression, deprivation and poverty” (Ministry of Education, p. 2004b, p. 170). The lesson was structured as a conversation in which students were invited to share their ideas about and experiences with various social problems. Because of this discussion-based method, Amina, an Iraqi refugee in the class, raised her hand and added that resettlement for refugees is another problem that some youth in Jordan face. Miss Sawsan acknowledge and confirmed the comment, then continued with her lesson. This shows the participatory teaching method employed by Sawsan enabled Amina to extend a conversation about social problems in Jordan to include those faced by herself and other refugee families. In the remainder of this section, I will focus on one detailed example representative of the mechanism of extension that took place within these classes.

During a social studies lesson on agriculture and livestock in Jordan, I saw Madha, a Syrian refugee student at the HYC initiate extension in the curriculum, and her teacher, Miss Nivin, embrace this flexible curricular engagement. To begin the lesson, Miss Nivin took out a book and began reading. The students grew silent and strained their necks to see the colorful pictures in the story she read. She made her voice high and sweet when the protagonist, a little girl, talked about the tree she planted, nurtured, watered, and observed as it grew to produce fruit. Miss Nivin made up a melody for the song the girl sang to her tree, thanking it for the berries. She made her voice deep and gruff when the father threatened to chop it down. When the girl proclaimed that nothing would happen to the tree and the father backed down, the students cheered with excitement.

When the story was over, Miss Nivin turned to the students and asked, "What do you think today's lesson will be about?"

"Agriculture!" one student responded.

"Exactly," Miss Nivin affirmed with a smile. This story began a lesson from an FT textbook entitled 'Agriculture and Livestock in Jordan,' which is a part of a broader unit on the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan which taught about Jordan through a patriotic lens as discussed earlier in the chapter.

Miss Nivin continued her lesson by eliciting information about students' experiences with agriculture, asking them "Who grows things at home?" Students eagerly raised their hands, pleading for Miss Nivin to call on them. Students told of olive trees and fig trees, grape vines, and berries. Madha, a Syrian refugee student who had been at the center for several months, raised her hand high. When Miss Nivin called on her, she told of the vast fields her family had back in Syria. While the lesson was meant to focus on agriculture in Jordan, the structure of the lesson as a discussion enabled Madha to share her personal history of agriculture in her home country of Syria, thus pushing to extend the curriculum in a way that included her lived experience.

Rather than divert the conversation back to agriculture in Jordan, Miss Nivin accepted Madha's extension and expanded it further by asking Madha about her family's fields, what they grew, and if they had animals. Madha smiled as she described long stretches of greenery where she would pick fruits, vegetables, nuts and herbs with her family. She also told of the chickens they raised and the eggs they used to collect. Madha's friend, Isra, another Syrian student in the class, also chimed in to share her experience with agriculture in Syria. When Madha finished speaking, Miss Nivin still did

not immediately return to the material in the official curriculum. Instead, she briefly spoke about how Jordan used to import produce and other commodities from Syria and how Jordanians benefited from Syrian's rich agriculture. She explained that while Jordan has made efforts to grow produce, the arid desert soil was not conducive to certain plants. During this brief discussion, Miss Nivin invited Madha and the other Syrian students to share with the class more about the agriculture in Syria and the produce and livestock they had. After a short detour, Miss Nivin brought the conversation back to agriculture in Jordan by stating that "although we bring products into Jordan from the outside, from Syria and Saudi Arabia and Libya, it would be great if we could produce our own products and be self-reliant." Because Miss Nivin and her students were not under pressure to rush through the textbook for an exam, they were able to show this flexibility and engage in this sort of curricular extension.

When I talked to Madha about this lesson in our interview, she smiled with pride. She expressed appreciation for the opportunity to speak about agriculture in Syria and was especially pleased that when she initiated the conversation, Miss Nivin embraced it by asking follow up questions like, "what did you do in Syria, what did you plant, what kind of animals did you raise?" Madha noted that it helped her to reminisce positively about life in Syria. She felt happy that Miss Nivin engaged her in the conversation and allowed her space to share about her life in Syria. Madha explained, "It was nice. We [Syrian students] were the ones doing all the talking…because we knew about it best." Although the curriculum focused only on Jordanian agriculture, Madha was able to bring in her own experience and Miss Nivin drew on her own knowledge and that of her students to expand the conversation.

In my interview with Miss Nivin and Miss Amal, they confirmed for me that FT students feel less pressure in school and FT teachers do not worry about "getting through" the curriculum. It is worth sharing their comments at length:

> Miss Amal: Students in public school face lots of competition. There are tests and grades and they're worried about is getting high grades. Here at FT, it's different. We do have exams before and after students start a level, and if you pass an exam you will go to another level. But our main goal is for the student to learn to read and write. In public schools, they are worried about getting the highest grade. There is competition to be the best….Students are focused are getting high grades and teachers are focused on finishing the curriculum.
>
> Miss Nivin: The [public school] teachers that I have worked with, that they have this mentality, this pressure to finish the curriculum. Their main concern throughout the semester is to finish the curriculum because a certain percentage of her students have to pass the exam. The teachers don't care about involving the students, they don't care about activities. Whether the student understands the lesson or not, that doesn't matter to her, she just needs to get through it. (April 12, 2017)

Through this conversation, Miss Nivin and Miss Amal explained that FT students are not under so much pressure to complete the curriculum. As a result, they are comfortable taking extra time to extend the curriculum in a way that makes it relevant to them. Additionally, teachers allow this and perhaps encourage it through their student-centered

learning approach because they, too, are not faced with high levels of pressure to prepare students for exams.

This vignette encapsulates the ways that students and teachers in FT demonstrated flexibility to extend the curriculum in ways that were inclusive of Syrian students and reflected their lived experiences. Madha took initiative to extend the classroom conversation in a way that tied to her own experiences as a refugee. The short opening example about Amina's brief comment about refugee resettlement, too, points to the technique of extension that included refugee experiences in the curriculum. Through the many instances I saw of this curricular extension, Syrian refugee youth took agency to carve a space for themselves in the classroom, thereby producing an educational experience that included and reflected their experiences.

Leadership as a Means of Curricular Engagement

Another way that refugee youth in FT asserted their agency in the classrooms and creatively engaged with the curriculum was by taking on leadership roles in the classroom both formally and informally. Refugee youth did this in numerous ways: by volunteering to do extra tasks, by helping their friends with difficult materials, and even formally leading small groups of students. This mechanism of leadership allowed refugee youth to have a prominent role in the classroom and, in doing so, forge a space for themselves and, quite often, received praise and encouragement from the FT teachers and administrators. Students were able to engage with the curriculum in this way because of the curricular emphasis on supporting leadership and active learning. Teachers encouraged students to support their peers and often even assigned students to teach

them. Thus, the curricular set up of FT created a space where Syrian students could take on leadership roles and create that space for themselves in the classroom.

Raneem, a Syrian refugee student at the Rufayda Center, stood out as a student who embraced her role as a leader in the classroom. She often volunteered to take on extra tasks in the center or serve as a role model in the class. For example, during a lesson on how to use Excel, she volunteered first to go up to the central computer and demonstrate what they were learning. When students were working in small groups, Raneem often took a leadership role in the group and helping other students when they struggled with a concept. When I spoke to her about this in our interview, she explained the following:

> I like to learn and some of the girls here don't know how to write and read so I would help them in learning to read and write. Miss Haya saw that and encouraged me to continue. So in class, I would take the first half hour and I would sit with the girls and help them read and write. (Interview, July 24, 2017)

According to Raneem, taking this leadership role to support the students helped her build relationships with the students. She told me:

> I used to teach [the girls] in a different way [from the teachers]. And if they were upset, I would ask them, 'why are you upset' and I would talk to them and help them. After that, I felt like the girls felt close to me and they would open their hearts to me. (Interview, July 24, 2017)

By taking on leadership roles in the class and becoming close to students, Raneem felt included as a valuable member in the classroom community. In addition to helping students with academics in class, Raneem also helped to organize an art exhibit based on

the extracurricular art activities they did at the Rufayda Center. Raneem set up a display of the students' artwork and arranged for some of the students to recite poetry they had written. They invited parents and other community members to come see the display. Raneem was very proud of this exhibit and felt that it helped her carve a space for herself in the classroom. As a leader in the classroom, she drew on her sense of agency to position herself as a vital member of the classroom community.

In my interview with Miss Ilham and Miss Lamis, the teachers at the Asma Center, they observed that Syrian students often took on these leadership roles, and explained that the centers benefited from this. Miss Ilham and Miss Lamis attributed this to the different educational backgrounds of the Syrian students. They explained that Jordanian students typically came to FT because they had struggled in the public schools or had difficult circumstances at home that led them to drop out. The Syrian students, on the other hand, left school because of the war, not because of a weakness they had in school. As a result, they tended to have stronger academic backgrounds than many of the Jordanian students.

I observed several Syrian students leverage their academic backgrounds to actively engage in class and support their peers. For example, during several basic literacy classes at the HYC, I observed Madha help the girls sitting at her table identify letters and spell words correctly. Similarly, I saw Amina support her students in a math lesson while they practiced the multiplication tables. By drawing on their educational backgrounds in Syria, which were different than many of the Jordanian FT students, Syrian students could support their peers and, as a result, present themselves as valuable members of the community. By taking on leadership roles in the classroom, gaining

attention and encouragement from their teachers and being relied on for help by their peers, refugee students made space for themselves where they could contribute their own knowledge and experiences into the classroom space.

Uncertainty and Curricular Engagement

A third way in which Syrian students engaged with and responded to the curriculum was through a sense of uncertainty, particularly regarding lessons related to employment and entrepreneurship. While they may have participated actively in these lessons and even talk about their professional aspirations, my conversations with many Syrian refugees revealed that they were participating in these lessons but unsure if or how those lessons really applied to them. This was particularly prevalent in the FT lessons around employment and entrepreneurship which, as I described earlier in the chapter, were key themes running through the FT curriculum.

When I interviewed Raneem, she had recently graduated from FT. In explaining her future employment plans, she told me the following:

> I'm very ambitious. I want to become something in this society. Whether I get married or not, I want to be a figure in society… I came to the center and they encouraged me a lot to become a student in the vocational training. So, in October, I will start vocational training. Well, I might register, but I might not. There is a possibility that I could go back to Syria or that I will be resettled in Germany. Well, I was rejected from resettlement in Germany. Maybe I can go to Syria or maybe I'll just stay in Jordan, I don't really know. I have dreams of becoming a university professor, but that won't happen. This needs university

education and I don't have that. But I could also go into pastry-making and become successful there. Or I could be successful in jewelry making.

In Raneem's explanation, one can see a great sense of uncertainty, or reference to what Dryden-Peterson calls the "unknowable future" of refugees (2017, p. 14). While Raneem was encouraged to receive vocational training, she was not sure if she would enroll. If she did enroll, she did not know whether to focus on pastry-making or jewelry making. A larger uncertainty rested on whether she would even stay in Jordan to attend vocational training or if she would seek repatriation to Syria or resettlement in Germany.

Raneem noted that the center encouraged her to go to vocational training. Indeed, FT teachers and administrators across the centers made great efforts to encourage students to consider vocational training and future careers and, as I illustrated, entrepreneurship and vocational aspirations were central to the FT formal curriculum. In addition to the prevalence of employment in the textbooks, FT teachers incorporated career planning discussions in their lessons and even offered workshops on different vocations or entrepreneurial skills. As a result of this curricular emphasis on employment, students spoke about potential career paths frequently. While Raneem was clear that she wanted to "be successful" and make something of herself, she was unsure quite how she would do that. Although her FT teachers encouraged her to receive vocational training, Raneem later revealed that she was not sure she could afford it. She had been excited about the idea, but she expressed frustration that her teachers did not mention the high cost of vocational training for Syrian refugees. Indeed, an FT administrator confirmed for me that, due to their status as international students, vocational training was ten times

more expensive for Syrians than it was for Jordanians (personal communication, December 17, 2017).

Raneem's indecision about her future occupation is deeply tied to what Dryden-Peterson (2017) calls the "unknowable future," (p. 21) the long-term uncertainty that refugees face. Refugee trajectories no longer align with UNHCR's policy solutions for refugee, repatriation, local integration, or resettlement. Rather, "they are non-linear and complex permutations of migration, exile, and consistently re-imagined futures" (p. 21). Raneem explained her uncertain and unknown future as follows:

> I have three options. Either I will stay in Jordan, or I will resettle to Germany, or I will go back to Syria. If I go back to Syria, cosmetology is the best path because salons there are really great. If I stay in Jordan, I want to go to the vocational training here and become a really good pastry chef. And if I go to Germany, I want to go to university and become a doctor.

Because of Raneem's unknowable future (Dryden-Peterson, 2017), she had imagined three different versions of her future employment possibilities, based on where she could possibly be living. Thus, her hesitation to enroll in vocational training was certainly tied to cost, but also tied to the uncertainty of its benefit to her.

Raneem, like other Syrian refugees, did not envision employment and the steps she would take to get there as innately tied to the geographic location of Jordan, as the curriculum put forth. In contrast to Dryden-Peterson's (2017) assertion that education can create certainty and "mend the disjunctures" (p. 15) of refugee trajectories, Raneem's story indicates a deep confusion, ambivalence, and ongoing uncertainty in the face of education. In my interview with Raneem, she stated "education is the future, education is

a good thing for me" and then followed it by saying "you can have a future without education. I have no education and I have a future" (interview, July 23, 2017). While Raneem could imagine multiple options for future employment and settlement, and these possibilities could each be supported by a different educational trajectory, she expressed confusion and uncertainty about how the future would unravel and the role of education in that future.

The uncertainty that refugee youth experienced and employed as a mechanism of engagement with the curriculum was also sparked and cultivated because of the curriculum and FT's emphasis on future employment. In the case of FT, education is envisioned as a pathway to employment and that goal highlights uncertainties for refugee youth whose employment opportunities in Jordan and migration opportunities elsewhere are precarious. This extends the argument of Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) in showing that even in contexts of high quality education there can be misalignment of possible and preferable futures.

Students also demonstrated uncertainty towards the employment curriculum due to perceived gender norms and expectations. For example, it was not uncommon for the female FT students to tell me that their employment prospects would depend on their marital status. While they often excitedly engaged in vocational discussions and training activities in the classrooms, many asserted a sense of uncertainty around the reality of employment. Many claimed that their husbands would likely not allow them to work, as was the case with Yamama, a student at the Rufayda Center who got engaged and left the center. Others agreed with Lutfiya, a Syrian student at the Asma Center who told me that

"If I get married, I would stop working…it's too difficult to be married and work" (interview, August 2, 2017).

The tension around a desire for employment and perceived gender norms was actually fostered within FT, cultivating a sense of confusion and uncertainty for students. It was also embedded in the textbook as a central value in Jordanian society. While teachers encouraged students to consider a career path, they also reinforced notions that education is important for their future role as wives and mothers. Thus the curriculum lent itself to a sense of confusion, which fostered a mechanism of uncertainty in its engagement by refugee youth.

Refusal and Withdrawal as Means of Curricular Engagement

A final practice of curricular engagement that contributed to the cultural production of the inclusive refugee education context was refusal and withdrawal. By that I mean that refugee students, at times, responded to curricular material by refusing to participate in the learning. In my observations, the refusal or withdrawal was never enacted boldly but, rather, a subtle withdrawal of participation from the lesson. I observed instances in which Syrian refugees withdrew from the conversation or activity, seemingly representing a silent rejection of the curricular material. I should note that this refusal/withdrawal was the least common technique I observed and most difficult to identify.

I observed curricular withdrawal most prevalently during a class at the Rufayda Center about the police. Miss Haya, the teacher, led a discussion about the police as public servants who protect and defend the people of Jordan. She explained to the students that we need police in order to protect the country and keep us safe. She

explained that we should all feel safe in our homes and our communities because of the police presence. Miss Haya drew on the material from the textbook and reminded students that the police kept the state safe by protecting the borders.

"We love the police and we love seeing them,[17]" Miss Haya declared and repeated throughout the conversation. Students responded with their own professions of love and appreciation for the police and the police presence in the community. Miss Haya divided the students into three groups and assigned each group to make a poster about the police's role in traffic and road safety. I sat with a group of three students: Yamama, a Syrian student, and two Jordanian students, Zayneb, and Basma. Zayneb and Basma eagerly engaged in the activity, discussing enthusiastically how to illustrate policemen helping people cross the street. Meanwhile, Yamama, who typically was an active participant in the classroom, remained silent and disengaged, doodling in a notebook on her lap.

I asked the students about the assignment and whether they actually felt that the police in Jordan did keep them safe, like the teacher said. Zayneb and Basma responded enthusiastically that they trusted the police and felt that the police kept them safe. I turned to Yamama who initially agreed with the Jordanian students that the police kept people safe. Then, with some reservation, she added that the police in Syria did not keep people safe. She made the statement quietly but definitively and returned to her drawing. When

[17] While there are multiple different police forces and other defense institutions in the country, and they are discussed with more specificity in the textbook, the conversation in class was very general.

Miss Haya asked students to present their posters to the group, Zayneb and Basma went to the front of the room to share their drawing, and Yamama stayed in her seat.

Unlike the previous lessons I discussed, where students inserted their own experiences to make the curriculum meaningful to them and facilitators embraced those contributions, Yamama reacted to this lesson by withdrawing. She did not collaborate with her Jordanian colleagues on a group poster and she did not join them to share the poster with the class. Miss Haya did not push Yamama to participate, nor did she inquire as to why she was not participating. I did not feel comfortable asking Yamama additional questions about her lack of participation or her perspective on the police, so I cannot fully explain why she did not participate. Yet, her lack of participation in the activity coupled with the comment she made about not trusting the police in Syria and her change in demeanor when the activity ended suggested to me a connection. By withdrawing from the lesson, Yamama engaged with the curriculum by actively rejecting the message embedded within it.

The withdrawal from and rejection of the curriculum represented by the vignette of Yamama is another mechanism by which Syrian refugee youth engage with the curriculum, albeit one I saw used less frequently. Rather than tolerating lessons and ideas with which disagree, some Syrian students withdrew their participation from it. In doing so, refugees students set the terms by which the curriculum could be experienced and enacted. They asserted their agency in engaging with the curriculum and refusing to enact curricular elements that contradicted their lived experiences. This withdrawal from the curriculum was made possible by the structure of NFE where academic achievement was not the only goal. Because Yamama and other students at FT were not necessarily

striving to pass the high school exit exam and continue to higher education, it was acceptable for them to "sit out" of a lesson.

Discussion and Concluding Thoughts

Returning to the two guiding questions stated at the beginning of this chapter, I have revealed that the primary curricular themes of Islam, Jordanian citizenship and nationalism, and employment shape complex notions of inclusion and exclusion for Syrian refugees where they are simultaneously rendered visible as part of a Muslims community and invisible as non-citizens. I have also illustrated four mechanisms through which students engage with the curriculum in response to the nuances of inclusion and exclusion, showing how those mechanisms of engagement are actually cultivated and reinforced through the curricular structure of FT. I have argued that while the content of the formal curriculum holds potential to exclude Syrian refugees, they assert agency to engage with the curriculum in various ways that renders them visible and active members of the community.

This chapter makes three contributions to our understanding of the relationship between curriculum and inclusive refugee education. First, my curricular analysis demonstrates that even if the national or global policy prioritizes the inclusion of Syrian refugees in the classroom, the curriculum serves as another national mechanism that limits the possibilities of inclusion. In the case of Jordan, I have shown that Syrian refugees remain absent from the curriculum, rendering it only somewhat relevant and possibly exclusive to the experiences and backgrounds of Syrian refugees. Without revising the national curriculum in a way that better reflects the experiences of refugees

in the country, and incorporating attitudes that are welcoming to refugees, the promise of inclusive refugee education as a means to foster social cohesion and social inclusion is limited.

Second, this chapter points to ways that Syrian refugee youth in the context of inclusive refugee education engage with the curriculum. By extending the curriculum, refugee students create ways to include themselves and their experiences in the classroom. In taking on leadership roles, refugee students shaped themselves as valuable members of the community. In addition to expanding their inclusion in the curriculum, I pointed to ways that students engaged with uncertainty and ambivalence. Despite the curricular emphasis on employment opportunities, refugee students demonstrated reluctance and, perhaps, inability to take too many steps towards this, given the unknowable nature of their futures (Dryden-Peterson, 2017).

Finally, this chapter contributes to our understanding of inclusive refugee education in the non-formal setting. I have argued that the mechanisms by which Syrian refugees are able to engage with the curriculum are possible because of the non-formal setting, which cultivates student-centered learning. Thus, this chapter makes the case for extending student-centered learning and the various techniques affiliated with this approach into other contexts of inclusive refugee education. Indeed, Bellino and Dryden-Peterson (2018) and Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) and Mendenhall et al. (2015) provide examples of the low quality of education in contexts of inclusive refugee education, and Mendenhall et al. (2015) explicitly tie low quality education in refugee contexts to a reliance on lecture and recitation and limited use of student-centered teaching approaches. This chapter illustrates how a student-centered curriculum creates

an opportunity for students to engage creatively with a curriculum and assert their agency to participate or withdraw. While in the next chapter, I problematize some of the teachers' pedagogical approaches to student-centered learning, I overall maintain that inclusive refugee education holds promise to cultivate inclusion of refugees in the classroom.

Chapter Seven: The Possibilities and Limitations of Caring Teaching Practices in FT

During my interview with Madha, a 16 year old Syrian student at FT, she told me about her educational experiences as a Syrian refugee in Jordan. For three months, she attended Jordanian public school during the first shift, integrated with other Jordanian students. Madha reported facing discrimination and bullying at the public school and explained that when she approached the teachers for help, "they didn't do anything. They didn't care." After just a few months in public school, Madha quit.

Madha was nervous when she began attending the FT program at the HYC. She was afraid the students would discriminate against her and that, yet again, the facilitators would allow it. Madha told me, however, that from her first day at the HYC she felt at home. She attributed her comfort at the HYC in large part to her FT facilitator, Miss Nivin. Madha explained:

> I feel such a difference between teachers in the public school and in the HYC. Here, if I am feeling down, they would cheer me up. They play games and activities to make us happy. To help us forget the war and all the problems in Syria. (April 12, 2017)

In short, Madha felt that the FT facilitators cared about her. Not only did they want her to learn, but they attended to her social-emotional well-being so that she felt good about herself and her surroundings.

FT facilitators told me that caring practices were central to the FT teaching methodology which I introduced in Chapter Four. Miss Nivin explained to me:

> I think the most important thing here is not just that the students are learning, but that they are supported and that they feel loved. And so I love all the students

equally…I try to do things that make them happy. (Field notes, February 15, 2017)

Indeed, in the time I spent with Miss Nivin in her classroom, I saw her demonstrate care, warmth, and kindness towards her students.

While Madha was generally happy with her experience at the HYC, there were still moments of tension with the Jordanian students and facilitators that made her feel like an outsider. While Madha mostly overlooked this behavior, she wished that "the facilitators would raise awareness" about the Syrian experience and their background to mitigate these negative experiences. Madha thought that explicitly addressing the issue might reduce some of the prejudice held by some students. Although raising awareness about social issues was a component of FT's Freirean approach that I introduced in Chapter Four, facilitators rarely addressed the Syrian refugee situation in the country or the discrimination they faced. As such, the social norms of Jordanian society which privilege Jordanians over non-Jordanians prevailed throughout the center.

Madha's story, and the educational care and support demonstrated by Miss Nivin, points to the complexity of teaching practices in contexts of inclusive refugee education. On the one hand, the relationship that Miss Nivin cultivated with Madha indicated a level of care between the facilitator and student that helped Madha feel supported at school. On the other hand, the caring pedagogy was limited by facilitators' insistence on sameness and sisterhood, which masked the discrimination and prejudice that Syrian refugees face in Jordan.

In this chapter, I analyze the complexity of the FT teaching practices. I illustrate that despite the claims of critical pedagogy at the HQ level, the pedagogical practice

employed by facilitators more closely resembles a pedagogy of caring (Noddings, 1984, 1988, 1994). I argue that while teachers' caring pedagogy makes strides towards supporting Syrian refugees in a context of inclusive refugee education, the pedagogy is informed, constrained, and structured by social and cultural beliefs and attitudes. As a result, the efforts made towards inclusion through caring teaching practices are muted by the FT facilitators' inability to see the social, structural, and political power dynamics that restrict Syrian refugees and, instead, perpetuate social inequalities and structural power dynamics. This is particularly salient in the context of FT which strives to uphold a Freirean approach to critical pedagogy. Through this chapter, I contribute to a growing body of literature that addresses teaching practices in contexts of refugee education. While a plethora of normative frameworks for refugee education assert that teachers play an essential role in providing high quality education that will facilitate inclusion (INEE 2010a, 2010b; UNDP and UNHCR, 2017; UNHCR, 2012), little is actually known about the practices and pedagogies of teachers in contexts of refugee education, particularly in countries of asylum. This chapter sheds light on the ways that broad social, cultural, and political dynamics are implicated in teaching practices.

As I introduced in Chapter Four, the FT pedagogy is guided by Freirean ideas of critical pedagogy and the notion that education can and should lead to social awareness and transformation. As I discussed in Chapter Four, FT facilitators are trained to use select techniques that were designed by FT to uphold Freirean pedagogy, including an emphasis on student-teacher relationships, dialogue, and activities. During my research, and as I illustrate in this chapter, facilitators understood the goals of these tools differently than FT HQ did. The purpose of this chapter, however, is not to point to

discrepancies between HQ and field-level practices or between the classroom and Freire's approach; rather, as Bartlett (2005) did in her study, the purpose is to analyze facilitators' practices and their effects on the inclusion of refugee youth.

Through my analysis, I identified three primary teaching practices used to cultivate a caring environment: building personal relationships, attending to the 'whole person', and teaching with patience and creativity. Yet, I illustrate how these practices were constrained by the dominant discourse of sameness and sisterhood which led to three mechanisms that othered refugees in the school: difference-blindness, silence/silencing, and prejudicial attitudes. By difference-blindness, I refer to an extension of colorblindness which I discussed in Chapter Four, an approach to ethnic-racial diversity that ignores ethnic and racial differences and asserts that people should be treated as individuals, without regard for race or ethnicity (Bonilla-Silva, 2011; Ferber, 2012; Walton et al., 2014;). Smith notes that often colorblind practices come from a place of good intention, with an effort to be sensitive to marginalized groups, but can result in the perpetuation of inequality. In this study, I use the term "difference-blindness," because the ignored differences were not related to race or ethnicity but rather to nationality and citizenship-status. My understanding of silence and silencing comes from Castagno (2008) and Fine and Weis (2003) who explain that silence is an absence of discussion about race and ethnicity while silencing is imposed on somebody else. Silence and silencing in schools serve to preserve an idea of equality and fairness within a broader social system of unequal power relations. I illustrate that facilitators' use of silence/silencing and difference-blindness leads to prejudicial attitudes towards refugees, relying on deeply engrained othering beliefs about Syrian refugees in Jordanian society.

Through these techniques and mechanisms, I demonstrate how the caring practices of facilitators were constrained by local beliefs and resulted in the perpetuation of social inequalities and structural power dynamics under the guise of inclusion and care.

The Role of Teachers in Refugee Education

Teachers play a central role in shaping a refugee's educational experience. Teachers' daily practices and pedagogical decisions greatly determine the overall quality of the education and shape the possibility that refugee education will be protective and productive rather than harmful (Adelman, 2018; Mendenhall et al., 2015). Global refugee education frameworks, such as the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergency's Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery (2010) and UNHCR's Global Education Strategy (2012), and the national Jordan Response Plan (2015) are normative documents that offer guidelines for teachers' practices in refugee situations, including directives for inclusion and creating social cohesion. They state that teachers should attend to the general well-being of all students, provide psychosocial support, and assist students in dealing with the effects experiencing conflict (INEE 2010a, 2010b, 2015; MOPIC, 2015). They should cultivate an inclusive environment in which all students, particularly those who have been excluded or marginalized in the past, are accepted (INEE 2010a; MOPIC, 2015; UNHCR, 2012). They should discuss issues of inclusion, diversity, and rights to ensure that all students are included in education (INEE, 2010), and help students develop skills to foster inclusion and peaceful living (UNHCR, 2012). Teachers should employ student centered teaching approaches that enable all

students to participate actively in learning, without discrimination (INEE 2010a, 2010b, 2015; UNHCR, 2012).

Beyond normative frameworks, there is a small yet growing body of literature that examines teaching practices for refugees in contexts of asylum (Dryden-Peterson, 2015; Mendenhall et al., 2015; Richardson, MacEwen, & Naylor, 2018). Studies show that teachers of refugees often have limited training (Kuwara, 2019; Sesnan et al., 2013) and are generally unprepared to support the challenges that refugee students face, including language barriers, lack of age-appropriate content, and interrupted schooling (Adelman, 2018). Mendenhall et al. (2015) explored the concept of pedagogical quality of education for refugees in Kenya across urban and camp-based public schools and community based schools. Focusing on teacher-student interaction, they found that teachers across their sample relied on a lecture-based instructional technique and lacked active engagement of students that encouraged critical thinking or conceptual learning.

In addition to pedagogical techniques for teaching academic subjects, researchers have studied teachers' approaches to providing social and emotional support for refugee students (Adelman, 2018; Dryden-Peterson, Dahya, & Adelman, 2017; Richardson, MacEwen, & Naylor, 2018). They found that social and emotional support plays an important role in fostering academic success. Dryden-Peterson et al. (2017) found that a strong teacher-student relationship facilitated the teacher's ability to support a refugee student's educational success. Participants in their study noted that the primary forms of teacher support were encouragement and academic help. In her study of education for refugees in Lebanon, Adelman (2018) argued that teachers prioritize different types of support based on their abilities and experiences. In the case of Lebanon, Adelman

showed that Lebanese teachers of Syrian refugees often focused on providing academic support, without giving attention to social or emotional support. Conversely, she found that Syrian refugee teachers prioritized social and emotional needs, drawing on their own experiences and understandings of forced migration. I build on this work by complicating the social-emotional support that teachers give to refugees and demonstrate its limitations in a context that does not acknowledge structural and systemic inequalities towards refugees.

Just as teachers can facilitate positive schooling experiences, they can negatively impact student experiences. They may rely on corporeal punishment, physical abuse, or tactics of humiliation to discipline students, resulting in the school as a violent and harmful space (Kirk & Winthrop 2007; Nicolai & Triplehorn 2003). Teachers can also disempower refugee students by marginalizing certain groups of students or limiting the possibilities to ask questions or think critically. Ignoring refugee students' histories of conflict and migration as well as their difficult situations in exile further contributes to harmful school environments (Dryden-Peterson, 2017). Much of this harm can be attributed to a lack of pedagogical training, limited resources for students and teachers, and restrictions in the curriculum (Mendenhall et al., 2015).

Teachers are vital to the educational experience of refugee youth and can contribute both positively and negatively to their academic experience. In the analysis that follows, I focus on the tensions between these possibilities in the context of FT. I build on the existing literature around teachers' pedagogy in contexts of refugee education by illustrating both the benefits of a caring pedagogy as well as its limitations.

Cultivating Relationships between Students and Facilitators at FT

Building Personal Relationships: "They Don't Feel I'm Their Teacher, They Feel More Like They're with Their Sister"

FT facilitators took efforts to build personal relationships with their students that extended beyond the traditional student-teacher relationship. Facilitators and students alike cared about each other and, in many small ways, built relationships that bordered on friendships. These relationships enabled facilitators and students to recognize and celebrate important events in their lives, such as engagements and birthdays. Facilitators also supported students in personal matters, including disagreements with their parents around marriages or schooling.

In interviews and informal discussions with FT facilitators, they all mentioned the close relationships they have with their students. Miss Lamis at the Asma Center explained:

> It's nice to have the student and teacher be close to each other and have a good relationship. We aim to avoid having [metaphorical] distance between teacher and student. We love them and get them to love us. If the student loves the teacher, she will love school. If she doesn't like the teacher, if the teacher is too rigid or strict, that will make her hate school. (Interview, August 2, 2017)

Other facilitators echoed this idea that they feel close to their students. For instance, Miss Nivin asserted, "I think the most important thing here [at FT] is not just that they're learning, but that they are supported and that they feel love. And so I love all the students—there is a mutual love between us" (field notes, February 15, 2017). In describing her relationship with the students, Miss Zayneb explained that "they don't

really think I'm they're teacher, they feel more like they're with their sister and their friend" (interview, July 26, 2017). Facilitators expressed the importance of building relationships that reflected friendship and care towards their students.

FT facilitators built these friendships by engaging students in personal conversations where they exchanged information about their lives. For example, before class began, Miss Ilham at the Asma Center always sat among the students as they trickled into the classroom, talking about their lives. Doing so demonstrated an interest in their personal lives beyond the classroom. Similarly, at the Rufayda Center, the facilitators, Fatima and Zayneb, often sat at the tables with their students during snack time. Like Miss Ilham, they engaged their students in conversations about life outside of class, both inquiring about their students' lives and sharing events from their own lives. By opening up to them about their lives and their families, they built friendships with their students. Facilitators asked about and attended to students' home lives, incorporating that knowledge into the ways they interacted with them.

Miss Ghadeer, a facilitator at the HYC, encapsulates the personal relationships between facilitators and students. Miss Ghadeer loved to tell jokes. I often walked into her class while she was telling a funny story about her children or her weekend, making her students laugh. It was not uncommon to walk into Miss Ghadeer's classroom during a break and see her sitting at one of the round tables with her students, chatting and laughing. This proximity to students was a hallmark of the personal relationship she built with her students. When I asked about her relationship with her students and she explained to me the following:

> I'm personally really close to the students. My relationship with them isn't like that of [public school] teachers. I don't consider myself a teacher with them, I'm more like their sister. When I teach, I do it while laughing or smiling. And if I have to talk to them about something serious, I do it in a friendly and caring way. I want them to learn important lessons, but I also don't want them to feel bad. For example, If I want to tell them that they should wear less makeup, I'd say it kindly, maybe with a joke, so they won't get upset. I can do this because they see me as their sister. They don't get mad or sad, and they accept what I am saying. (Interview, April 19, 2017)

Miss Ghadeer's remarks about her caring approach to teaching and the ways that she uses this care to address serious issues in class highlight the importance of personal relationships for helping students to feel comfortable and welcome in the classroom.

In addition to showing care and kindness to impart lessons, Miss Ghadeer built relationships with her students by paying attention to their home lives and remaining aware of how their family situations may impact their behaviors in school. She noted in our interview that many of the students come from difficult situations, which impacted her expectations and how she interacted with them:

> Miss Ghadeer: Some of them, their dads are in prison, some of them come from divorced families, some of them their mothers were killed, we have Syrian refugees… And that's on top of the financial problems that exist for every single person here. There is no girl who comes here that doesn't have a financial problem.
>
> Elly: How does this affect the way you teach them?

> Miss Ghadeer: It affects my teaching in that the girls are not always focused [on learning]. They're thinking about other things and other problems. Some girls come to class one day laughing and then the next day crying. They have a lot of mood changes. And with my expertise, I got better at knowing that, oh, this girl is going through a hard time. Just by looking at her I can tell that there is something wrong. And if I sense that [something is wrong], I will call the girl aside, if she doesn't talk to me on her own, and I'll ask, 'is something wrong?' And she might tell me or she might not. If she doesn't, I will leave her alone and not pressure her. When she's ready to talk, even if it's in the middle of class, the student can ask to talk to me, and I'll go outside and we'll talk about it. (Interview, April 19, 2017)

Her awareness of the challenges that students faced at home helped Miss Ghadeer understand and respond to certain students' behaviors in the classroom. Because of the personal relationships she had with her students, she was able to reach out to them and provide additional support as needed. This was particularly important for students at FT, most of whom came from difficult family backgrounds.

I witnessed Miss Ghadeer attend to these personal issues one day when her students were playing a game reviewing parts of speech. Each student took a turn at the game and when it came to Hiba's turn, she froze. Hiba's mother had died several years prior and, as a result, she had a great deal of anger and a quick temper. Hiba was not sure what to do on her turn and when another student tried to help her, she grew angry and yelled at the student to "shut up." Instead of scolding her or punishing her, Miss Ghadeer kindly reminded Hiba that "we don't speak to our friends that way, please apologize." After class, I saw Miss Ghadeer speaking privately to Hiba. When I inquired later about

the conversation, Miss Ghadeer told me she reminded Hiba about the anger management strategies they had worked on. She explained that she did not want to embarrass her by discussing it in front of the class and, instead, she felt it was more appropriate to wait until afterwards. This vignette illustrates the ways that FT facilitators develop personal relationships with their students and draw on those relationships to provide a range of both academic and social-emotional support to their students. This was particularly useful when working with youth who came from difficult backgrounds, including refugees.

Similar to the findings of Mendenhall, Bartlett, and Ghaffar-Kucher (2017) in an American school for newcomers, these personal relationships between student and teachers enabled a supportive learning environment where students were encouraged and cared for by their teachers. It demonstrates the value of personal relationships in providing care for students. Yet, as I show later in the chapter, these personal relationships represented a "friendship strategy" that was limited to personal chatter and conversation between students and facilitators (Bartlett, 2005). Facilitators did not engage students in meaningful conversations about their lived experiences and daily realities as refugees. Despite the philosophy of critical pedagogy upheld by FT, facilitators did not make efforts to cultivate awareness or address inequality or oppression faced by refugee youth.

Caring for the Whole Person: "We Aren't Here Only to Teach"

In addition to fostering personal relationships with their students, FT facilitators demonstrated love and care for their students by giving attention to all aspects of their lives, not just their academic learning. Miss Nivin, a facilitator at the HYC, described her this broad support as her central goal as a facilitator. She explained:

> [Our goal is] to raise awareness and understanding—to create an aware generation that knows how to deal with people, and that the students have confidence in themselves. We aren't here only to teach, it's teaching, guidance, and awareness at the same time. We want a generation that is aware, that knows where they are and where they are going in the future, who thinks properly, so that they would know what to do in a difficult situation. (Interview, March 12, 2017)

As the quote suggests, the facilitators viewed their role as holistically shaping students and preparing them for their future, by offering psychosocial support on a range of topics raising awareness of social and cultural issues, fostering hobbies and potential vocational skills, and preparing them for their futures as wives, mothers, and employees.

Many facilitators at FT provided psychosocial support to their students, frequently offering informal counseling or formal lessons on moral, social, and emotional issues that they viewed as important for young women in Jordan. For instance, I observed a class at the Rufayda Center where Miss Fatima, the facilitator, asked students to reflect on the different emotions they feel throughout the week. Students shared different emotional experiences they have had and, together, they discussed strategies for dealing with different emotions such as anger, frustration, or stress. During our interview, Miss Fatima explained that her role as a facilitator is "to deal with the students in a caring way, *attending to their mental health,* not just consider that one plus one equals to" (interview, July 26, 2017). Miss Fatima understood her role as a teacher in FT as going beyond academics to also providing guidance and emotional support to students.

FT facilitators often worked with the Education Program Coordinators based at FT HQ to bring in specialists who could provide additional emotional and psychosocial

support. The Rufayda Center brought in guidance counselor who came periodically to conduct lessons for the class and held individual sessions with students who wanted them. I was present in the class during her first visit, when she introduced herself. She told the students, "I don't work on educational issues—I can't support you in math or science—but I can help you become better people…and help you to get better in areas in which you want to improve" (field notes, January 17, 2017). The HYC, which had more resources than other centers given its relationship to another NGO, had a guidance counselor and psychologist on staff. They conducted weekly lessons for the students on a range of social issues, such as communication styles, stress management, and early marriage. Additionally, students were encouraged to visit the psychologist at any point to talk about personal challenges they faced, which ranged from students dealing with depression and post-traumatic stress syndrome, domestic abuse and drug addiction, to interpersonal relations between students.

I asked Mr. Yazar, the Director of Education at the HYC, about his educational goals for the center. He answered as follows:

> I want the students laugh…their smile is so important. I want the student to be able to hold a book and be able to read and write, that's what I want…*The goal is also to build their personality, their moral character, and build self-esteem*. They should be able to build themselves. They should be productive and good people in society. (Interview, May 18, 2017)

The facilitators took on this responsibility for the development of personal character by providing lessons about social issues such as early marriage, drug use, and the importance of education.

In addition to offering psychosocial support to students, the three centers I observed offered special workshops and activities that sought to foster hobbies and develop non-academic skills. Students learned to play chess, cook certain dishes, make jewelry, and knit. Miss Amal at the HYC told me the following:

> The kids may have interests like, for example, music. So we get someone who has experience in music and they will come and teach them… Some students are good with handicrafts and when we see a student with an interest or talent or skill, we may hold a one week workshop or course for them to practice and develop that. (Interview, March 12, 2017)

With the considerable resources available at the HYC, the facilitators were often able to design skills workshops around the interests of just a few students. They offered extra-curricular music classes, jewelry making classes, and painting classes, to name a few.

Both the Rufayda Center and the Asma Center held sessions where students learned to knit and crochet. I attended two of these sessions at the Rufayda Center, and the students really enjoyed them. Some students were deeply focused and intent on learning to knit or crochet, seeing it as a fun hobby as well as something that could potentially generate income for their family. Other students seemed uninterested in learning the skill but enjoyed having a casual day where they could spend time with their friends. The centers also ran other workshops "on things like cosmetics, makeup and these things, and etching on the glass, and wood burning…they get a change. It's not just books. It's different" (interview, July 26, 2017). Miss Lamis at the Asma Center reinforced this idea when she said that "The students benefit a lot [from these activities], for their psychological well-being" (interview, August 2, 2017).

Facilitators at all three centers emphasized the importance of these activities for supporting the development of their skills, for breaking the routine, and for their potential to generate income and contribute to students' livelihoods in the future, all aspects of caring for the whole person. In the following excerpt from my field notes at the Asma Center, the facilitators told me about a crochet and knitting workshop they held for the students and a cosmetology workshop. Cosmetology is one of the vocational training tracks that many of the female students express interest in, thus providing the workshop aimed to support students in their aspirations.

> Miss Ilham: It's too bad you weren't here when we did the knitting and crocheting workshop. It was really great, the girls loved it.
>
> Miss Lamis: Yes, they really learned a lot from it and have even started knitting and crocheting at home.
>
> Miss Ilham: Yes, it was really great that they could learn a skill like knitting, which they could then continue to do at home or whenever they want. And when they want to sell something, they could just sell it and make some money.
>
> Miss Lamis: We also had a cosmetology workshop, and they learned how to do makeup and hair. Someone from a salon came in to do the lesson and brought in straighteners and hair dryers. Can you imagine—some of the girls had never used a hair dryer! This was really great because then the students started taking care of themselves, too. (Field notes, July 31, 2017)

In this short exchange, Miss Ilham and Miss Lamis noted two important ideas. First, facilitators tended to believe that teaching these skills helped students to take better care of themselves and supported their personal development. Second, they saw these

skills not only as important for personal development, but also as a way to help students support themselves and their families financially, by giving them skills that they could help them earn money now and in the future. Thus, facilitators provided lessons and activities that supported the student as a whole person with potential to support the students' families, too. Yet, as I discuss later in the section, FT facilitators seemed unaware of the legal restrictions Syrian refugees faced in obtaining work, thus limiting the impact these lessons had on Syrian refugees.

The centers also demonstrated a care for the whole person by remaining aware of and attending to the economic conditions of the students' lives. For the most part, FT students—both Syrian and Jordanian—came from low income households. As Miss Ghadeer at the HYC explained, "We have kids with many problems, with many personal and psychological problems…And that's on top of the financial problems that exists in every single person here. There is no girl who comes here that doesn't have a financial problem" (interview, April 19, 2017). Bajaj (2009) notes that relational caring based on strong personal relationships between students and teachers links teachers to students' lived realities and their material conditions. While FT facilitators did attend to the material realities of students, as I demonstrate below, this represents the extent of the facilitators' connections to their refugee students' lived realities.

The centers addressed poor economic conditions in different ways. FT provided students with all necessary school supplies, so students did not need to buy notebooks, pens, or text books. The centers also provided daily snacks to the students, and the Shuhada Center, which received extra funding from a second local organization, provided a full meal each day. Facilitators noted the importance of the snacks that FT provided,

given that many students come to the centers without having sufficient food at home. Miss Zaynab at the Shuhada Center explained:

> If there is a girl who comes up to me and says I have a problem, I'll say what's wrong. If she says this and this is going on at home, to be honest I need money, I don't have any money to eat anything, I would give her money from my personal account. This is totally normal for us. (Interview, July 19, 2017)

There were also several instances where the centers provided students with material goods beyond school supplies. In February of 2017, the HYC received funding to take their students shopping and buy them winter clothes. During Ramadan, the facilitators at the Asma Center used the funds they normally would spend on daily snacks to buy the girls purses and perfumes. Once after a field trip, the facilitators at the Rufayda Center took the girls shoe shopping and bought them each a pair of shoes.

By providing support to students and their families, facilitators demonstrated care and concern for the student as a whole person. They took the emotional and mental state of students into consideration through formal counseling and informal check ins and conversations. They supported students social and moral development through classes and activities. They responded to the poor economic conditions of the students by providing materials, food, and, when possible, additional gifts. Paying attention to students as a whole person, rather that solely focusing on academic skills, contributed to the caring, inclusive environment that made students feel welcomed and supported. Yet as I illustrate later in the chapter, this approach to caring for the whole student was limited by a lack of critical awareness of refugee situations and their distinctions from the

conditions of Jordanians. Thus, while attending to the whole person helped refugee students feel included and supported, this form of care was limited.

Teaching with Patience, Care, and Creativity: "I Teach Them the Very Basics"

The academics at FT focused heavily on literacy and numeracy, and FT facilitators did so with patience, care, and creativity to support student learning. Facilitators acknowledged that most of their students had been out of school for a significant period of time and often required basic literacy and numeracy skills. Moreover, facilitators understood that many of their students had negative experiences in public schools, many Jordanians because of academic struggles and Syrians because of discrimination. Facilitators aimed to reverse those feelings of shame by developing a culture of support and encouragement at FT. Facilitators demonstrated their care for teaching and learning by showing kindness and patience as students learned a new concept and working individually with students to support their learning. They employed activities and other student-centered techniques to engage students and making learning fun and demonstrated flexibility and a willingness to change or adapt a lesson based on students' interests.

In observing facilitators across the centers, I repeatedly witnessed high levels of patience and care for learning. The facilitators taught their lessons slowly and with great patience, and their willingness to return to the basics as needed, to review basic addition or multiplication or how to properly write a certain letter or read a word, reinforced the notion that they cared for the students and their learning. For example, during a math lesson on multiplying fractions at the HYC, Miss Sawsan noticed that the students were struggling with multiplication so she changed the lesson to focus on basic multiplication

tables. When Miss Nivin at the HYC wrote lessons on the board, she would often pause her writing and ask students to identify the different letters she was writing. Adelman (2018) found that some Lebanese teachers of Syrian refugees in Lebanon also adopted this approach of "moving slowly through the curriculum" (p. 89) in order to support their students, yet noted that there was a limit to their patience, expressing frustration when students did not advance. Because of the non-formal environment of FT, FT facilitators had added flexibility to repeat lessons and abandon elements of the curriculum if needed. Students appreciated these types of reviews and, as opposed to public schools, in FT they felt comfortable asking their facilitator to repeat something. Lutfiya, a Syrian student at the Asma Center, told me, "When the teacher explains something, she explains it well, and if someone doesn't understand, the teacher will repeat it" (interview, August 2, 2017). Knowing that the facilitators cared that students learned helped students to feel comfortable asking questions and receiving the help they needed to advance academically.

Many facilitators gave significant attention to each student individually, often differentiating a lesson or activity based on certain students' needs. As Miss Zayneb, the English facilitators at the Asma Center, noted, "we work with every student individually. We consider it a success when we get to work with every single student individually" (interview, July 26, 2017). I often witnessed Miss Nivin do this, too. In conducting a group activity, she would assign specific roles to each student, based on their needs and abilities. She would select a stronger student to be the group leader and give a weaker student another role that would equally empower them and help them feel important.

Often when students were sitting in small groups, she would sit with a particular student or group of students to provide them extra assistance.

Like Miss Ilham, facilitators also demonstrated care for student learning by using a creative, student-centered, participatory approach in their teaching which can contribute to greater opportunities for learning (Mendenhall et al., 2015). In contrast to Mendenhall et al. (2015) who found that teacher-centered pedagogy prevailed in refugee education in Kenya, FT facilitators made a concerted effort to implement student-centered learning. While there is much to celebrate about this student-centered learning approach, it did not reach the expectation held in HQ of raising awareness of social issues, cultivating a critical consciousness, and contributing to social transformation. While there was variation in the extent to which facilitators included activities, discussion, group work, and other student-centered methods, the facilitators typically implemented it to the best of their ability. The Arabic facilitator at the Shuhada Center explained the concept like this:

> The method [of teaching]…is participatory learning, do you know it? The idea is that we give the information to the student in a nice and smooth way, maybe through a song, through a play, through a short video or sketch that we show them in order for the knowledge to reach them and in order to get them to like education more. (Interview, July 19, 2017)

These creative and participatory methods helped students to enjoy learning and succeed in their education. In a group interview with two students at the Asma Center, they stated:

> Huda: Here [at FT] the [facilitators] explain the lesson in a way that you understand it and you don't have to learn it on your own afterwards…

> Iman: ...Let's say we're learning the multiplication tables. The [facilitator] would turn on the computer and show it to us in a fun way….the teacher might draw something fun and then we would draw, or we would use the calculator, or the computer or the board. There is more than one method of teaching. The teacher doesn't just walk in and start writing on the board. (July, 26, 2017)

Huda and Iman highlighted a few important things about their facilitators' way of teaching. First, they emphasized the facilitators care for their learning, by stating that the facilitators "explain the lesson in a way that you understand it." Second, Iman noted that the learning is fun. She pointed to different activities a facilitator might do to teach multiplication, including drawing or using technology. Finally, Iman pointed out that the facilitators use multiple different games, activities, and creative methods to convey information to their students. The creative and participatory approach reinforced their learning and academic achievement, though it did not foster critical social awareness or consciousness.

Mayar, the Arabic facilitator at the Zainab Center, affirmed that facilitators use multiple methods of education and highlighted the role of dialogue in the classroom. "It's not direct education, we're doing teaching through situations, games, and activities…We have a dialogue with the girls, ask their opinions…and eventually they get to the information on their own" (interview, August 14, 2017). Despite Mayar's use of the word dialogue, the way that she describes dialogue, and the way I saw dialogue used in the classroom, did not generate critical awareness but, rather, was reduced to classroom discussion. This form of dialogue, though not aligned with Freirean critical pedagogy aligns with Nodding's (1988, 1994, 2005) assertion that the use of dialogue and activities

cultivates a caring learning environment in the classroom. It helps students feel heard and respected in the classroom, building their confidence. It requires students to work together and listen to each other, with an open mind, and work through differences of opinion patiently and skillfully, thereby developing their own abilities to community, resolve conflict, and care for each other. Instilling the value of care and tolerance in the students, by bringing them to work together across differences, contributes to an overall sense of inclusion.

A final way in which facilitators illustrated their care for learning is by the flexibility they exhibited in their teaching. Facilitators responded to students' moods and interests to ensure that lessons were relevant and engaging. They remained willing to change their plan at a moment's notice to accommodate a student request. For example, I observed a class at the HYC in which the guidance counselor, Miss Manar, engaged students in a discussion about early marriage. The conversation elicited tears and frustration from some as they shared their opinions on the practice of early marriage and their family's expectations for their future. After an hour or so, the conversation tapered off. The girls had grown quiet, their eyes glazed over and their minds clearly wandering to other places. A few girls began fumbling through their purses and some turned to their cell phones for quick relief; others folded their arms and looked towards the clock.

"Miss," called Ghofran, a Syrian student who had been quite active in the conversation, "can we listen to music?" I saw several girls look up expectantly, eyes wide and heads nodding. "Can you play Shik Shak Shok?" Ghofran asked, evoking whoops of excitement from the other girls.

"Shik Shak Shok" they chimed, pleading Miss Manar to play the latest hit song. Without hesitation, Miss Manar called up the song on YouTube and played it for the class. Upon hearing the first set of chords, Ghofran jumped out of her seat, tore her pink leopard print scarf off her head, tied it around her waist in proper belly dancing fashion, and began shaking her hips. Some girls joined her, while others sat in their seats watching and clapping along. They danced and talked for a few songs, and then Miss Manar returned to the lesson on early marriage. When I asked Miss Manar about the lesson later, she explained that she understood how challenging these counseling lessons can be and was happy to give the students a physical and emotional break. Through this flexibility, facilitators taught lessons in a way that made students feel listened to and respected. It drew on Freirean notions of critical pedagogy by empowering students to participate and giving them a voice in the activities, showing students that the facilitators cared about their opinions. Through such flexibility which allowed girls to sing, dance, and talk about popular culture in the classroom, the students came to enjoy coming to school and saw learning as a fun and enjoyable activity. Moreover, engaging in activities together helped students to build relationships with each other and foster a greater sense of inclusion. The flexibility that Miss Manar and other facilitators showed helped cultivate a caring environment and demonstrated facilitators' respect for students' needs. FT facilitators made efforts to center the needs of their student and, as a result, developed a caring pedagogy. Yet, as I illustrate in the next section, facilitators viewed their students as a homogenous group without distinguishing the unique needs and conditions of refugee youth. As a result, efforts to build personal relationships, attend to the whole persona, and to a lesser extent, foster academic achievement fell short. Their inability to see the

inequalities refugees face—particularly in the face of an organization claiming to use critical pedagogy—constrained their caring efforts and led to a perpetuation of inequality in the school. I now turn to a discussion of three mechanisms that limited facilitators' caring approach: difference-blindness, silence/silencing, and prejudicial attitudes towards refugees.

Limiting Relationships between Students and Facilitators at FT

Difference-Blindness in FT: "We're all Sisters, We're all the Same"

The first mechanism that limited facilitators' caring practices is difference-blindness. As I introduced in the beginning of the chapter, difference-blindness is an extension of colorblindness by which people ignore ethnic and racial differences claiming that all people should be treated equally without regard to difference. It was quite common to hear facilitators assert the notion of sisterhood that I have discussed previously in this dissertation, that there are no differences between Syrians and Jordanians and, rather, "we are all the same." As I discussed in Chapter Five, this sameness was sometimes attributed to a shared Arab identity and sometimes to a shared Muslim identity. Miss Ghadeer explained to me, "we are all Arab and we are all Muslim. …We're all sisters." Miss Zayneb, an FT facilitators at the Rufayda Center, similarly told me that "we consider Syrians and Jordanians all one. We don't have Syrian students, Palestinian students, and Jordanian students. They are just students" (July 26, 2017). In this statement, Miss Zayneb asserted that there are no distinctions between the Syrian refugee students, Palestinian student and Jordanian students; rather, she saw them as a unified, homogenous body of students with similar experiences, backgrounds, and lived

realities. Neglecting to acknowledge the differences between the students and their experiences allows facilitators to believe that inequality towards Syrian students, in FT and in Jordan, does not exist.

As a result of the difference-blind ideology of FT facilitators, they did not acknowledge the unique structural constraints that Syrian refugees faced in Jordan, particularly in regards to educational and employment pathways. As a result of this difference-blindness, facilitators neglected to consider or understand the ways that Syrian's experiences and possibilities in Jordan were actually quite different from those of Jordanians. Facilitators encouraged all students equally to consider continuing their education after FT, by either returning to formal school or enrolling in vocational training. Yet, facilitators did not acknowledge that those opportunities were significantly limited for Syrian refugee youth. At the time of my research, the MoE did not have a clear policy on whether Syrians could continue into the formal school system after graduating from FT and haphazardly allowed some to continue and prevented others. While Syrians could enroll in the national vocational training program, they were required to pay as international students, which too expensive for most of the Syrian students at FT. Additionally, through their emphasis on vocational training, FT facilitators encouraged all students equally to consider their options for future employment. Facilitators encouraged students to work hard in the various vocational-related workshops, like knitting, cosmetology, or project planning, because they could use those skills to start a business and earn money for their families. Miss Ilham told me that they offered a cosmetology workshop to provide students marketable skills that they could use in a future career. Miss Amal at the HYC attempted to motivate students to

learn English by touting its value in the workplace and Mr. Yazar explained that students should focus on learning English because, in some fields, it is a requirement for employment.

Similarly, entrepreneurship and an emphasis on employment and vocation was a key feature of the FT curriculum and FT facilitators made broad claims about the possibilities of employment and income generation without recognizing the limitations to Syrian refugees. Until February of 2016, bureaucratic hurdles and high costs prevented most Syrians from obtaining work permits; the majority of Syrians employed in Jordan worked illegally, without documentation, facing exploitation and abuse. In February, under the Jordan Compact,[18] the GoJ began the process of opening jobs in certain, low-skill sectors to Syrian refugees. Yet, despite the Compact, many jobs which were strongly encouraged by facilitators and desired by students, such as hairdressing and clerical work, remained fully or partially closed to Syrians (Hunt, Samman, & Mansour-Ille, 2017). In addition, the GoJ released new regulations for the formalization and legality of home-based businesses which technically allows Syrians to register businesses in the "intellectual sector" including "mobile maintenance, interior design, and consulting only (IRC, 2018); however, the IRC reported that the government prohibits their registration, pointing to security concerns and potential competition with Jordanian businesses (2018). It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to detail the politics and practices of Syrian

[18] The Jordan Compact is an agreement between the Government of Jordan and international donors, signed in February 2016, in which Jordan pledged to expand access to education and employment for Syrian refugees in exchange for increased funding with international donors.

refugees in the Jordanian labor market, but suffice it to say that the opportunities for young Syrian refugee women to work in Jordan remain extremely limited and, in some cases, dangerous due to the high amount of abuse and exploitation (for more information, see: Amjad et al., 2017; Hunt et al., 2017; IRC, 2017, 2018; Lenner & Turner, 2018). There were Syrians in Jordan who worked informally, including FT students; yet, FT facilitators—who engaged in discussions of other social issues—never discussed the risks of exploitation or abuse that many Syrian refugees, especially youth, experienced (Amjad et al., 2017; IRC 2017, 2018). Overlooking the difference between Syrians and Jordanians through a difference-blind ideology led facilitators to discuss opportunities for Syrians as if they were the same, potentially pointing Syrian refugees towards impossible or exploitative employment situations.

By presenting the same future pathway for all students, either by pursing home-schooling or vocational training, and encouraging the possibility of employment, facilitators neglected to acknowledge—perhaps because they did not know—the structural constraints their refugee students faced in their possible futures as well as the transnational realities of their lives. Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) posit the encouragement of multidirectional aspirations as a core element of a critical transnational curriculum that supports and benefits refugee youth. By that they mean that facilitators and school staff should prepare refugee youth for transnational possibilities. One way they suggest this can be done is with staff who are aware of the different ways that students could pursue multidirectional aspirations including opportunities for study and employment in various locations. In the case of FT, this did not occur due to facilitators' insistence on seeing all students as equal, with equal opportunities. It was reinforced by the presence of a

difference-blind ideology at the HQ level that did not train facilitators to support multidirectional aspirations. This finding reinforces the assertion of Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) that different educational actors have different ideas of the purpose and utility of education for refugees. This extends their work by pointing to even the differences that might exist between students and facilitators and points to the possibility that variation in understanding educational purposes for refugees can be identified based on limited knowledge of facilitators and educational personnel.

By asserting a difference-blind ideology, facilitators also overlooked the unique experiences of Syrian refugees. For instance, FT facilitators frequently explained to me that students at FT left school because they struggled academically and did not enjoy going to school. Miss Zayneb explained this in our interview, saying "the students here left school because they didn't like school. They just didn't like it, so they left" (July 26, 2017). Some facilitators gave nuance to this idea by explaining that students with bad grades were shamed by their teachers and other students, which pushed them to leave school. Yet, this narrative that students at FT were not good students and faced humiliation at school ignores several aspects of many of the Syrian refugees' experiences in school. First, it denies that, for Syrian refugee students, leaving school was not a choice they willingly made but, rather the conflict forced many of them to leave school. Second, it ignores the very real discrimination and harassment that Syrian refugee students face in public schools in Jordan, often leading Syrians to drop out, not because they do not enjoy school, but because they faced significant forms of discrimination which should not be tolerated (REACH 2015; Stabe et al., 2017). This reinforces the necessity of training teachers of refugees to understand the diversity of their students,

which could hold benefit for the refugee students as well as the entire student body (Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017).

The notion of difference-blindness that facilitators employed to assert their acceptance of all students, enabled facilitators to engage in subtle forms of discrimination and othering of Syrian refugee students by distinguishing national others. For example, while leading a physical education lesson at the Rufayda Center, Miss Lubna, the EPC, also made a point to distinguish the Syrian refugee students from the Jordanians. The students were out in the courtyard participating in a range of competitions such as relay races. Miss Lubna instructed the girls to sing a song and whoever sung loudest would win. As they were singing, she called out "Where are the Syrian girls? I don't hear you!" I saw a few of the Syrian girls look down, embarrassed, as the rest of the girls continued to sing (field notes, January 17, 2017). In singling out the Syrian girls, Miss Lubna marked them as different. While she certainly did not intend to offend the students or make them uncomfortable, simply calling for the Syrian girls to sing loudly reminded everyone of their difference. This small exchange served to highlight their difference, note their lack of participation, and cultivate a sense that they were Others in the classroom. It also points to ways that a difference-blind ideology served to reinforce and reify the differences that existed between refugees and citizens.

Despite the claim that FT facilitators did not see difference, they frequently made private comments to me about a student's nationality, and in doing so, highlighting to their difference. On my second day of observations at the HYC, I wrote in my field notes:

> All the facilitators I have spoken with today made a point of telling me that they have students of all nationalities [at the center]. They all say something to the

effect of "We have Syrian refugees and Iraqi refugees and Palestinians and Egyptians and Jordanians, and it doesn't matter. When they come to the center, they are all people and national identity doesn't matter." (Field notes, December 28, 2017)

Throughout the year, facilitators and FT administrators were quick to tell me that they have multiple nationalities in the centers, emphasizing the presence of refugees. It almost seemed like a point of pride that their center welcomed refugees in their classrooms and that the facilitators treated them equally. Although facilitators and administrators frequently upheld the notion that national identity doesn't matter, the mere fact that they constantly distinguished students by their national identity demonstrated otherwise.

I often wondered how much my presence and the subject of my research contributed to the labeling of students as Syrian or Iraqi, especially in private conversations with facilitators. Facilitators knew my research looked at the experiences of Syrians in FT. At times, I know that I provoked them to bring nationality into the conversation when they otherwise would not have. For example, early in my observations, I asked Miss Nivin for help identifying Syrian students in her class. I assumed she knew who they were and could point them to me privately. Instead, she stopped the class and asked loudly, "Who here is Syrian? Who is Iraqi? Palestinian with citizenship? Without?" I was taken aback at the brazenness of the question and realized that she would not have asked that without my prodding (field notes, December 28, 2016).

The ideology of difference-blindness that facilitators ascribed to restricted the impact that caring could have on the students by rendering much of their caring as minimally relevant to students. Moreover, because of their difference-blindness, which they saw as a virtuous quality, facilitators were comfortable voicing and acknowledging difference in ways that perpetuated a distinction between students without critical discussions of the meaning of these differences.

Silence and Silencing in FT: "I Never Bring it Up"

The second mechanism that limited the caring practices of FT facilitators is silence and silencing, particularly in regard to nationality and citizenship status. This mechanism is closely aligned with and reinforced by the difference-blind ideology discussed previously. It was frequently in the name of difference-blindness that facilitators engaged in silence or silencing around nationality or citizenship status. My impression was that FT facilitators frequently upheld this silence as a benevolent effort to avoid discrimination. That is, if they did not discuss the discrimination that was taking place either in the centers or in Jordan, facilitators and students could imagine that it was not happening. Facilitators were often quite adamant in their efforts to avoid talking about nationality or citizenship/refugee status and, even when it came up, the topic was silenced. For example, Miss Amal told me that "we never discriminate or differentiate between a Syrian or Jordanian or Egyptian. These differences are not mentioned at all. Never. I never bring it up" (March 12, 2017). Similarly, Miss Ghadeer explained that she tried not to even use the terms Syrian or Jordanian. She did not want to mention these differences and raise tensions or arguments between the students. Yet, as scholars argue, the silence around difference such as nationality tacitly perpetuates the status quo and the

marginalization of minorities such as refugees (Castango, 2008; Smith et al., 2014; Walton et al., 2014).

Several facilitators used their silence to avoid mentioning conflict in Syria or the experiences of their Syrian students as refugees. Miss Ghadeer explained, "I did my best to avoid talking about the Syrian conflict, or mentioning it at all because, if I mentioned it, they would remember…Here, this is a place for them to forget, to forget everything, their worries and sorrows and to play and do activities." Miss Ghadeer, like the other facilitators, viewed any discussion of Syria or the Syrian conflict as something that would further the Syrian students' distress and trauma. When I asked Miss Lamis if she ever talked about Syria in her class, she told me the following:

> No, no, we don't talk about that topic. I don't let them. I tell them we are here for one reason, we are here to learn, no matter what your nationality is whether you are Syrian or Egyptian or Jordanians, you are here to learn. I have taught them to respect each other. (Interview, August 2, 2017)

In our interview, Miss Lamis would not even say the word Syria; rather, she called it "that topic." She insisted that all students were at the center to learn, which precluded talking about Syria. This shows the emphasis on social and emotional learning and raising awareness of social issues is limited to acceptable, non-controversial issues. Miss Lamis also asserted that the students do not talk about Syria because she has taught them to respect each other. In her view, discussing Syria is disrespectful to Syrians. This points to the way that the use of silence is underscored by a difference-blind ideology that sees even the mention of difference as offensive. While the facilitators seemed to have a good intentions in not wanting to remind students of Syria and their difficult experiences, it

undermines their care for the whole person by offering support to some (Jordanian) students on personal issues and not others (like the Syrians). While facilitators are not psychologists and cannot provide in-depth support to help Syrian students deal with previous experiences of war and trauma, they can make themselves available to listen and provide referrals as necessary.

The silence around refugee-specific issues led to other moments when facilitators missed opportunities to provide social-emotional support to refugee students. For example, as a result of conditions around Ghofran's urban settlement in Jordan, she had to spend the duration of Ramadan in the Zaatari refugee camp. While the HYC was aware of the situation, neither Ghofran's facilitators nor the psychologist reached out to offer her support. When I encouraged her to do so, she told me that she did not want to talk to them because they would not understand. In another instance, students at the HYC gathered for a special theatrical performance about drug use and abuse. When I spoke to Dana, a Syrian refugee student, about the play, she told me that the play had upset her and reminded her of her ex-husband, who had been abusive to her because of his drug addiction. When I asked her if she spoke to anyone at the HYC about it, she responded that she did not because, like Ghofran, she did not think that they would be able to help her.

These two examples of Syrian students choosing not to reach out to their facilitators for illustrate times when refugee students would have benefited from extra support from FT staff but did not seek it because of the staff's silence. Their general silence around refugee issues indicated to Ghofran and Dana that the FT facilitators

would not be able to or interested in supporting them, despite the emphasis FT facilitators placed on providing social and emotional support.

When tensions between Syrians and Jordanians arose in the centers, facilitators quickly silenced them and moved on. For example, during Miss Amal's class one day, an argument broke out between a Syrian and Jordanian student when the Jordanian student called the Syrian a derogatory term. Miss Amal was quick to silence the students, instructing them to sit down and stop yelling. She then launched into a lecture which I had heard her give before, explaining that they are all sisters and should love each other. She asserted that they needed to see that there are no differences and that we all get along in the center (field notes, January 15, 2017). Rather than critically address the discrimination, which would align with the critical pedagogy encouraged by FT, she shut down the conversation and drew on a difference-blind ideology to assert that they were the same. Miss Reema similarly told me that when tensions arose in her classroom between Jordanians and Syrians, she tells them that they had to get along: "I tell them that the classroom is their house, I am their mother, and they are all sisters" (field notes, February 15, 2017). These examples point to the ways that FT facilitators silence discrimination when it arises by ignoring it rather than engaging with it in a productive fashion. While this is unfortunate in any situation, given FT's supposed emphasis on awareness of social issues, it is particularly surprising that FT facilitators would brush these comments under the rug rather than engage in them. This silence around national differences and discrimination more broadly highlights the difficulties facilitators have in addressing these issues. Holding conversations around discrimination and refugee status can be difficult and overwhelming for teachers; yet, by ignoring them, FT facilitators

allow the majority students to continue their discrimination without repercussion and they send a message to the minority, Syrian students that the facilitators do not care about the discrimination they face, which undermines the great efforts FT facilitators take towards caring for their students.

There were also occasions where FT facilitators actively silenced Syrian students who wanted to talk about Syria or their experiences as Syrian refugees. For instance, in a lesson Miss Manar gave about early marriage, she spoke generally about the dangers of early marriage and the physical and emotional effects it can have on girls. She showed two videos about early marriage and opened a discussion from the students about the topic. Ghofran, a Syrian refugee student in the class, raised her hand and made a comment about the rate of early marriage in the Zaatari refugee camp. Rather than engage with Ghofran and continue this line of conversation, Miss Manar silenced her. She did not respond to comment and, instead, called on another student whose hand was raised. While this silence and silencing was likely unintentional, it prevented a conversation that could have helped students—and Miss Manar—better understand the experience of Syrian refugees with early marriage.

Negative Prejudicial Attitudes towards Refugees in FT

In addition to a difference-blind ideology and facilitators' use of silence, the FT facilitators' maintenance of prejudicial attitudes towards refugees also limited the care they provided. As I will show, these prejudicial attitudes included deficit thinking about Syrian refugees and contributed to an othering of Syrians in the school culture.

Several facilitators approached their Syrian students from a deficit position, which often led facilitators to blame the Syrians for their situations, rather than considering the

oppressive contexts and structural constraints in which they live. For example, Miss Hiba told me:

> Education is not a priority for the Syrians. I saw this when I was working in the Makani program [a program in Jordan for Syrian refugees]. Students would come to us, 12 years old, 13 years old, that didn't know how to read or write. I would ask them, where have you been? They would say, I didn't go to school because of the war. Ok, that was four years ago. What happened between then and now? … They would just leave school to work. And I saw students that had good ideas, who were smart, who wanted education. I had a student like that, but then after one week, she was absent. I called her family to ask where she was because I wanted her to participate in the program, and her mother told me, "she is working. If she goes to the field and picks tomatoes and gets money for the family, this is better for me than her education." Better than education? I told her, "honey, listen, your daughter is really smart. She has potential, you will all benefit if she learns." (Interview, July 19, 2017)

In this quote, Miss Hiba blamed the Syrian students for not knowing how to read or write, rather than considering their situations and reasons why they might not have been able learn to read and write. This perspective arose frequently in discussions of Syrians' schooling. Although most students—Syrian and Jordanian—enrolled in FT because they had been out of school for too long, rendering them ineligible to enroll in public school, their reasons for being out of school typically differed. FT facilitators, however, frequently blamed Syrian students and their families for their low levels of literacy and lack of education. While telling me about the importance of caring for her Syrian

students, Miss Zayneb said, "This kind of child, who leaves school, has the kind of parents who don't care about them. What parents make their child leave school and do not do their best to give her an alternative? They don't give their child any care at all" (July 26, 2017). In my interview with Miss Ilham, she praised two of the Syrian students, saying "they are really great students, they're not the type who, you know, they *actually* care about their education." In her use of 'you know', Miss Ilham implicitly contrasted her two Syrian students who cared about education with most Syrians who, she believed, did not care about education. Miss Ilham saw that her two students succeeded in school yet, she viewed them as exceptions to the typical Syrian student who did not care about school and, therefore, does not succeed. This deficit approach which blamed Syrians for their situation limited the extent to which some facilitators were willing to show care for their students learning.

In upholding negative attitudes towards Syrians in Jordan, FT facilitators also expressed a level of resentment towards Syrians in the country. I saw this in the ways that several facilitators spoke about a Syrian penchant for business and their desire for money. In a conversation with Mr. Yazar, the Director of Education at the HYC, he asserted that Syrians only cared about money. He claimed that Syrian refugees enroll their children in multiple educational programs that provided cash to cover the cost of transportation. They collected this money for transportation but did not actually send their children to attend the program. Miss Nour told me something similar, saying that "The Syrians who are here, they want money…so they come to the center because they get paid for transportation." This idea that Syrians took advantage of the humanitarian system for their own financial gain reflected a broad societal resentment towards Syrians and the

influx of service and support they receive in Jordan, from which many Jordanians could also benefit.

Additionally, several FT facilitators noted that Syrians in Jordan have strained infrastructure in Jordan, contributing to increased rental rates, unemployment, and cost of living. I heard this clearly from Miss Ghadeer, who told me:

> There are people who don't want Syrians living here, they don't like that they are living here. They see how it negatively affected them, like how unemployment went up, and rent went up, crimes have spread, it's a problem. They see Syrians being here as a problem.

Miss Ghadeer began this comment by noting generally that people "don't want Syrians living here," potentially excluding herself from that opinion. Yet, she also claimed unequivocally that "unemployment went up, and rent went up, and crimes have spread," as a result of the presence of Syrians. These negative impacts on Jordan are no longer just the opinion of some people, but ideas she recognized as fact that is "a problem" for Jordan. Miss Ghadeer reiterated the role of Syrian refugees in raising the unemployment rate in Jordan. She explained that "finding jobs is much harder now because people prefer Syrians when they're hiring because the Syrians will accept a lower wage. Someone hiring will say, I want a Syrian, not a Jordanian" (interview, April 19, 2017). In a conversation with Mr. Yazar, he told me how Syrian refugees had hurt the Jordanian education system by overcrowding the schools, leading to poor quality education and a deterioration of the school buildings (field notes, January 22, 2017). In my interview with him, he also noted that Syrians have taken Jordanian jobs and have contributed to the increase in rental costs (interview, May 18, 2018).

The negative attitudes that facilitators held towards refugees in Jordan, even if they saw their own students as exceptions, show how even the most caring facilitators are not impervious to dominant norms and attitudes of broader society. Facilitators upheld negative ideas toward their refugee students which were masked by their difference-blind ideology. This prejudice facilitators hold also reinforces prejudice in the center through their silence and tacit perpetuation of discrimination in the classroom.

Conclusion

The provision of social and emotional support through pedagogical practices of caring have been shown to support the academic achievement and inclusion of refugee youth (Dryden-Peterson, et al., 2017; Mendenhall et al., 2017). This chapter demonstrated three ways that FT facilitators support to their students through three practices of care. First, facilitators build personal relationships with their students. Second, facilitators attend to students as a 'whole person,' looking beyond just their academic performance and, instead, providing support for a range of issues they face. Facilitators support students' social-emotional well-being, vocational prospects, and economic realities. In academics, facilitators use a slow and patient approach to teaching to support their students' learning. They also use student-centered approaches in the classroom to facilitate learning in a way that engages students in the learning process, demonstrating respect for their ideas.

While I have demonstrated the benefits of a caring pedagogy in the context of inclusive refugee education, this chapter expands our understanding of pedagogy for refugee students by pointing to the complexity and limitations of providing care. Despite

the FT facilitators' efforts to care for their refugee students, these caring efforts were limited by the social and cultural beliefs and attitudes that facilitators' held about refugees. I demonstrated how a difference-blind ideology prevented facilitators from identifying, understanding, and attending to the social, political, and material realities of refugee youth and, instead, enabled facilitators to perpetuate a division between students by pointing to refugees as different. I illustrated how the use of silence and silencing further perpetuated distinctions between refugees and non-refugees and tacitly permitted students to continue to uphold negative attitudes and discrimination towards refugees. Finally, I showed that because of their lack of critical attention to the realities of refugee students, facilitators maintained prejudicial attitudes towards students, reproducing dominant ideologies about and inequalities towards refugees. These mechanisms of discrimination that I have illustrated serve to mute facilitators' efforts towards caring and, instead, perpetuate social inequalities and structural power dynamics within FT.

Through this chapter, I contribute to our understanding of pedagogy in the context of inclusive refugee education. I argue that while caring in the classroom makes strides towards supporting refugee youth, those practices are informed, constrained, and structured by dominant social attitudes towards refugees. To help teachers better care for and serve their refugee students, they must have knowledge about the conditions of their refugee students and their experiences. Teachers should have greater understanding about the lived realities of refugees and the inequalities they face in society. Education administrators—in this case, the FT administration—must include specific information about refugees, their situations, and their experiences in their training program for teachers. Moreover, providing teachers will tools to critically reflect upon the ways that

their teaching practices effect their students can help teachers minimize their perpetuation of inequalities and maximize the effects of their caring practices.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

In 2016, the world witnessed the highest levels of forced displacement since World War II, and the number of forcibly displaced people has continued to grow since then (UNHCR, 2017a, 2018a). Of the 68.5 million people who had been forcibly displaced from their homes by the end of 2017, 25.4 million of them were refugees seeking safety outside the borders of their home country (UNHCR, 2018a). Given this proliferation of refugees around the world combined with the recognition that refugee situations have become increasingly protracted and that only a small percentage of refugees are ever resettled in a third country (UNHCR, 2018a), education in the country of asylum often represents a refugee child's "main shot at education" (Dryden-Peterson, 2011a, p. 9). While the right to education is enshrined in many international policy documents (including the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, the 1989 CRC, and the Sustainable Development Goals), only half of the world's refugee children and youth are in school (UNHCR, 2018b).

In its 2012 strategy for refugee education, the UNHCR introduced a new paradigm for refugee education that prioritized the "integration of refugee learners within national systems*"* (UNHCR, 2012, p. 8). This approach overturned decades of widespread educational practice which segregated refugees into their own schools, where they would often study the curriculum of their home country in the language of their home country (Dryden-Peterson, 2016). In contrast, the new approach, inclusive refugee education, encourages the inclusion of refugee students into the education system of the host country, such that they study the national curriculum of the host country in the national language and from national teachers. While this approach is upheld for its ability

to provide refugee students with access to high quality education in contexts of asylum, little is known about the practices of inclusive refugee education and the experiences of students and teachers in that context. Research to date indicates that many teachers are not adequately prepared to support learning for refugee youth (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018; Mendenhall et al., 2015) and that refugee youth continue to face discrimination and exclusion in these contexts (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018).

This study sought to contribute to our understanding of the processes, practices, and daily experiences of inclusive refugee education. To do so, I conducted a yearlong ethnographic study examining the education of Syrian refugees in urban areas in Jordan. Jordan has adopted the model of inclusive refugee education and integrates Syrian refugees into its national education system, calling for "sustained access to quality and inclusive education for Syrian refugees" (MOPIC, 2016, p. 43). While Jordan has been making small strides towards increasing access to education (UNHCR, 2017b), Syrian refugees in Jordanian schools continue to report incidents of discrimination, bullying and violence in the inclusive context (Stabe et al., 2017). In an effort to highlight the "bright spots" of inclusive refugee education (Heath & Heath, 2010, p. 27), I focused my study on the FT NFE program, which offers a two-year accelerated learning program for refugee and local youth living in Jordan. In this environment, anecdotal evidence indicated that occurrences of bullying and violence have been minimal.

This study set out to understand the practices and experiences of inclusive refugee education in the particular context of FT. In doing so, I sought to examine what, if anything, was being done by students and teachers in this space with a particular eye towards the way they created relationships and built inclusion. Additionally, I wanted to

analyze the social and cultural structures that shaped the practices of inclusive refugee education, including policies, discourses, school structure, and curriculum. I did so with the understanding that although the state may seek to reproduce these structures through schooling, students and teachers are active agents who produce, contest, and negotiate these structures in varying ways. Thus, I sought to examine the ways that Syrian refugee students, Jordanian students, and Jordanian teachers navigated, negotiated, resisted, and rejected those structures in order to produce and reimagine new cultural forms of inclusion.

There are three primary findings of this study. First, I showed how students in the context of inclusive refugee education produced a culture of inclusion by drawing on a sense of sameness. Building on shared identities as Muslims and Arabs, students highlighted their commonalities in order to construct inclusion based on friendships among the students. This process of "coming together" (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018, p. 10) contributed to an environment in which Syrian and Jordanian youth enjoyed each other's company.

However, I also argued that this sense of sameness was conditional and, at times, called into question, particularly by Jordanian students. When commonalities were challenged and differences between refugee students and national students were revealed, the culture of inclusion was ruptured. More specifically, I found that Jordanians placed conditions on inclusion around the use of local language and an expectation of gratitude towards Jordan as a hosting country. When refugee youth used their own languages, when they expressed longing for Syria, or when they criticized Jordan in any way, the culture of belonging that had been constructed by shared identities fractured. The

conditionality of inclusion points to the ways that a culture of inclusion is always in process and never fully achieved. Inclusion is not a box that can be checked off, but rather it is a goal towards which students and teachers must always be striving. While Jordanian students may have held power to condition inclusion based on language and an expectation of gratitude, refugee youth demonstrated nuanced ways of resisting and contesting this conditionality to construct alternative forms of inclusion. In the face of constraints placed upon them by national students, they asserted agency to shape their own forms of inclusion. In particular, refugee youth drew on their transnational realities to cultivate a culture of inclusion in the face of conditionality.

Second, I found that while the content of the national Jordanian curriculum limited the possibilities of inclusion by striving to inculcate loyalty to the nation-state, refugee students adopted creative ways to both expand and challenge the constraints of the curriculum. This finding illuminates the agency of youth in the face of restrictive schooling structures. I identified four primary mechanisms students used to engage with the curriculum including extending the curriculum, taking leadership in the curriculum, uncertainty in curricular engagement, and withdrawal and refusal in curricular engagement. Through these mechanisms, students demonstrated their agency to shape the curriculum and, as a result, their schooling experience in ways that reflected their lived realities. I argued that this sense of agency was enabled and fostered by the structure of NFE and the flexibility and support it provided to students. That is, teachers and students demonstrated willingness to expand, deviate from, or ignore elements of the curriculum because they did not face the pressures of grades and assessments that students in formal schools faced. This finding builds on the work of Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) in their

introduction of a critical transnational curriculum for immigrant and refugee youth. It also builds on the work of Bajaj, Argenal, and Canlas (2017) on socio-politically relevant pedagogy and points to the need for culturally and politically responsive and relevant curriculum and pedagogy in contexts of inclusive refugee education.

The third key finding from this study relates to the complexity of teaching practices in the context of inclusive refugee education. I found that, on the one hand, teachers at FT drew on caring practices to provide social and emotional support to their students. While this was rooted in FT's philosophy of critical pedagogy, in practice it more closely resembled a student-centered pedagogy of care. Through a student-centered pedagogy of care, teachers built personal relationships with their students and gave attention to all aspects of their students' lives, not just their academics. Regarding academic learning, teachers worked with students with patience and care, moving through lessons slowly and giving individualized attention as needed to support academic achievement. This care provided by teachers went a long way in cultivating a warm and welcoming space of inclusion.

However, these caring practices were constrained and muted by the impact of the social, cultural, and economic power relations in Jordan on teachers' understandings of and attitudes towards their refugee students. In Chapter Seven, I illustrated how teachers drew on a sense of difference-blindness which actually enabled teachers to point to difference and the otherness of refugees. I demonstrated the use of silence and silencing around refugee issues that perpetuated the notion that refugee and national students were the same, with similar opportunities and experiences. I also pointed to the prejudicial attitudes teachers maintained toward their refugee students which limited the impact of

their care. These three techniques illustrate how local beliefs constrained the caring practices of teachers and perpetuated social inequalities and structural power dynamics in the school.

Based on these findings, I advance two primary arguments. First, I argue that inclusive refugee education holds potential to serve as a space that builds positive relationships and a sense of inclusion among refugee and national students. As I have shown through my research, Jordanian and Syrian students overall have built a space based on shared interests and identities in which they get along and genuinely enjoy each other's company. I further argue that the flexibility and supportive nature of FT, which stem from its non-formal nature, enable students and teachers to engage in an ongoing process of cultural production to cultivate, navigate, and assert a culture of inclusion for refugees.

Second, I argue that despite the potential inclusive refugee education holds to foster inclusion among refugee and national students, those who advocate for and provide inclusive refugee education must recognize that these educational spaces are not immune to the social, cultural, political, and economic struggles taking place in society at large. It is essential to attend to issues of power and justice and ways that cultural dynamics, political and social discourses, and matters of class, gender, and citizenship status, construct a broad social system and how that system plays out in schooling (Kinchelo & McLaren, 2002). Schools are situated within unequal relations of power in larger society and serve as spaces that both reflect those relations while also serving as sites to contest and navigate them (Apple, 2013; Giroux, 1983). I have illustrated the broad discursive tensions between cultural assertions of hospitality and political and economic interests of

the state and, in line with cultural production theory, pointed to ways that students and teachers interact with and navigate these discourses to shape and condition inclusion (Levinson et al., 1996). The theory of cultural production enabled me to illuminate and analyze the ways that students and teachers confront, navigate, and negotiate broad ideological and material conditions in the particular context of FT to investigate the production of inclusion. Even in a "bright spot" (Heath and Heath, 2010, p. 27) like FT, where students build friendships across citizenship status and teachers provide social and emotional support to their students, the production of inclusion is also structured and constrained by national discourses and state interests that, in the case of Jordan, position refugees as outsiders who pose burdens to the state and its citizens.

Thus, based on my analysis of the cultural production of inclusion in FT, I propose a theory of inclusion in the context of inclusive refugee education that conceptualizes it as an ongoing process that is continually being constructed, navigated, and negotiated by multiple education actors whose interactions in the classroom reflect unequal relations of power in wider Jordanian society. This explanation of inclusion enables an analysis of education that includes both the local and national level. At the local level, my theory of inclusion attends to the micropractices of construction and negotiation as taken up by school actors including students, teachers, and administrators. It points to ways that inclusion is not a box that can be checked off but, rather, something that actors are continuously constructing and reshaping. This theory of inclusion also calls for attention to global level dynamics including an understanding of policies and discourses and the ways in which they are interpreted and appropriated, which sheds light

on the unequal power dynamics in society (Shore and Wright, 1997; Sutton & Levinson, 2001).

Implications of the Study

Refugee Education

This study holds implications for scholarship, policy, and practice in the field of refugee education. By drawing on ethnographic data, this study expands our understanding of the micro-practices of refugee education and their intentional and unintentional effects. It challenges the idea that education for refugees is inherently beneficial (Davies & Talbot, 2008; Duncan & Arnston, 2004) by pointing to the nuances and complexity of educational experiences for refugees. This study points to the ways that, even in the context of a "bright spot" (Heath and Heath, 2010, p. 27) of refugee educational provision like FT, practices and processes of education can still have negative unintended consequences that perpetuate inequalities and negative attitudes towards the other.

In my examination of inclusive refugee education, I have theorized that inclusion is an ongoing process that is shaped, navigated, and negated by various education actors including national and refugee students and teachers. Through this process, both refuge and national students participate in the production of inclusion, its conditionality, and its refashioning to fit the needs of the students. I theorize that this process is influenced by the larger social, political, and economic structures and ideologies in society that constrain refugees' possibilities and impact attitudes of both nationals and refugees towards the other. In offering a theory of inclusive refugee education, I built on the work

of Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) who have theorized more broadly that inclusive refugee education holds the potential to enable refugee youth to construct and navigate their relationship with country nationals and the host country. My theorizing around inclusive refugee education offers an explanation for what occurs in a particular inclusive space of NFE for refugees as an ongoing act of negotiation embedded within a broader social fabric. Drawing on critical theory expands the work of Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) and highlights the lived experiences of inclusion in the face of broad social and political constraints.

This study also makes a contribution to the scholarship around curriculum and pedagogy in the context of inclusive refugee education. I contribute to a small but growing body of literature that documents and analyzes the practices of teaching in the context of refugee education in countries of asylum (Adelman, 2018; Mendenhall et al., 2015; Richardson, MacEwen, & Naylor, 2018). This work revealed the need for teachers to understand the structural and systemic limitations that refugees face in society—in school and beyond—and for curriculum and pedagogies that reflect those realities. In this way, curricular materials and pedagogical approaches can adequately prepare students with relevant knowledge and skills for the various possible futures they face (Dryden-Peterson et al., under review). This study also revealed that although a pedagogy of care can go a long way in supporting refugee youth, teachers' minimal understanding of refugee situations and an inability to reflect on teaching practices limits the influence of those caring pedagogies. Without understanding the limitations that refugees face, caring relationships and pedagogies have potential to do harm while also doing good.

Lessons from this study hold implications for the policy of refugee education both in the local context of Jordan and in the global context. Refugee education policy needs to provide greater clarity around the expectations and understandings of inclusive refugee education. As this study has shown, despite the label of 'inclusion,' there are a range of practices that occur in schools that run contrary to a notion of relational inclusion. This call for clarity is reinforced by Dryden-Peterson et al. (under review) who note that there is little agreement on the purpose of inclusive refugee education at the global, national, and local levels. Without such clarity, providers of refugee education will continue to face challenges in offering education that is inclusive.

A second implication for refugee education policy is the need for curricular reform that will make the curriculum relevant for refugee as well as national students. This study revealed that the national curriculum of Jordan does not reflect the socio-economic realities of refugees; the absence of refugees in the curriculum can have exclusive effects on refugee students and can further the idea that exclusion of refugees is acceptable among national students. Curriculum reform at the national level that, at the very least, recognizes the presence of refugees in the country could go a long way in cultivating inclusion. Building a curriculum that draws on notions of the critical transnational curriculum as introduced by Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) would create even greater inclusion of refugees as well as country nationals who, in an increasingly globalized world, also have transnational realities. Using diversity as a learning opportunity that enables students to learn from each other will benefit all students, not just refugees. Similarly, promoting civic engagement in a way that encourages students to think critically about inequities in society will also benefit all students and build skills

towards democratic participation. Finally, as Bajaj and Bartlett (2017) suggest, modifying the national curriculum to cultivate "multidirectional aspirations" can also benefit all students, particularly in a country like Jordan where many students seek to work abroad in their future. While civic engagement and encouraging multidirectional futures may be viewed as antithetical to Jordan's nationalist goals, it is my contention that they will ultimately serve to strengthen the students' as global citizens and, therefore, the knowledge economy of Jordan.

This study also holds implications for the practice of refugee education. In particular, it calls for greater attention to ongoing teacher training and support that will support the education of refugees. While this study revealed the use of caring pedagogies which did support refugees, it showed how those pedagogies were constrained by teachers who did not have a full understanding of the structural and systemic issues that refugees faced and who tacitly upheld prejudicial attitudes towards refuges. Teachers would benefit from trainings that provide a critical overview of the situation of refugees in the host country and a review of the realistic possibilities that refugees face in their future. Additionally, teachers need to be given tools to reflect critically on their own teaching practice as well as space to engage in such reflection on a regular basis. This will strengthen their ability to use their reflective skills and to be adaptive in their teaching practices in order to support their students.

Comparative and International Education

This study's focus on inclusion bears implications for the field of Comparative and International Education. While scholars tend to focus on children with disabilities in their study of inclusive education (Messiou, 2016), there is an increasing understanding

of the need to be more inclusive with the concept of inclusion (Schuelka et al., forthcoming). Indeed, a broad understanding of inclusive education has been amplified in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Four, which seeks to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education" (UN, 2016). Target 4.5 of SDG 4 explicitly expands inclusion beyond disability as it seeks to "eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education….including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations." Thus, this study contributes to a small but growing body of scholarship that looks at inclusion of a diverse range of marginalized children in education. Additionally, studies of inclusive education tend to focus on attitudes towards inclusion, description of inclusive processes and barriers, and theories of inclusive education (Amor et al., 2018). This study, then, contributes to our understanding of the experiences of inclusion and takes a critical approach to analyzing the processes and practices of inclusive education. Doing so emphasizes the role of broader social and cultural attitudes and structures in shaping inclusion in schools.

Additionally, this study has implications for the comparative study of education in the Middle East region. This study follows in the tradition of critical ethnographers who have examined the micropractices of schools in the region to understand what schools produce and how they produce it Herrera (2003; 2006; 2010), Mazawi (1999, 2002; 2010), Adely (2004, 2012), and Shirazi (2009, 2012, 2015). These scholars have made strides in challenging notions of social reproduction and undermining the assumption that because schools in the Middle East function under centralized and heavy-handed bureaucracies, there is no room for social or political struggle. My work contributes to this scholarship in two ways. First, this study contributes to this literature by focusing on

refugee populations. While some scholars have included Palestinian refugees (and their descendants) in their critical ethnographies of the Middle East (Shirazi, 2012; Fincham, 2012), this is one of the only studies centered on non-Palestinian refugees. As the population of non-Palestinian refugees continues to grow in the Middle East in a policy context that prioritizes inclusive refugee education, there is a need for studies such as this one that explores the possibilities and limitations of inclusive education for refugees in the region. Second, this study expands our understanding of education in the Middle East by focusing on the NFE sector. This emphasis provides additional insights into the possibilities that educational practices and processes hold when students and teachers do not face pressures of high stakes testing that are common in the region (Buckner & Hodges, 2015).

Directions for Future Research

A dissertation is a large project centered around a finely narrowed area of inquiry. Throughout the course of this study, from the beginning phase of conceptualizing the project, through the duration of my field work, and into the analysis and writing process, I have had to make decisions about what to include in the study and what to put aside for future research. To do so, I followed the lead of my participants and what emerged as relevant and important to them. This led me down a path of exploring relational inclusion (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018) and focusing on the microlevel processes of inclusion. Thus, missing from this dissertation is greater discussion of refugee inclusion in society beyond FT, and the role of political and economic dynamics in shaping this inclusion. Similarly, it was beyond the scope of this dissertation to examine in-depth the role of the

state and notions of cultural citizenship for refugees (Ong, 1996; Rosaldo, 1994). Yet, these remain critical issues for understanding the current condition of refugeeness and further analysis of educational inclusion can shed light on the relationships between refugees, host country nationals, and the state.

In addition, there are possibilities for (at least) four lines of inquiry that would enable me to build off of and expand this study. First, there is a need to expand this study to examine the processes and practices of inclusive education in the formal school system in Jordan. The majority of in-school refugee youth in Jordan attend public schools and, as such, an examination of formal schooling would provide a clearer picture of inclusive education for refugees in Jordan. Given that inclusive education has emerged as a policy priority for UNHCR and international development community more broadly as indicated in SDG 4, expanding our sociocultural understanding of how this policy functions in practice, what it does and does not do is paramount. Undertaking such a study would also allow me to draw comparisons between the formal and non-formal sector, which could illuminate the variations in each sector and how the different pedagogical and curricular approaches shape inclusive experiences. Conducting such a study may pose difficulty given the challenges of access I encountered during my research, but I believe could be carried out by engaging with public school students (and possibly teachers) outside the context of school. While this would remove the possibility of observations and, as such, limit such a study, I believe examining the ways that teachers talk about their pedagogical approaches and listening to students share their experiences in the classroom could be illuminating.

Although this dissertation focuses on Syrian refugees, I spent time with other refugee populations in Jordan, including Iraqi, Yemeni, and Sudanese refugees. It became clear that they had significantly different experiences of education in the context of inclusive refugee education. Thus, a second direction for further research is a study that seeks to understand the experiences that different refugee populations have in schools and that tries to unpack why that is and what that tells us about refugee experiences. In Jordan, there was a strong sense that Sudanese refugees were racialized in public discourse, resulting in significantly greater amounts of discrimination. Yet, this has not been examined systematically nor has it been investigated with a particular lens towards educational experiences.

A third direction for future research is a deeper investigation into the lives of students outside the school. While school plays a critical role in shaping young people, we know that they are influenced by a wide variety of formal and informal institutions in society including family, religious institutions and the media (Fincham, 2012) in addition to the constellation of international development and humanitarian agencies, including the UNHCR. Thus, another avenue for future research would be to expand my ethnographic examination into other institutions. I am particularly interested in understanding the role of families in shaping notions of inclusion and exclusion as well as students' experiences of inclusion beyond the environment of inclusive refugee education. Such a study would shed light on broader processes of inclusion and marginalization in society and the way that young people understand and negotiate them. In a similar vein, I am interested in investigating the role and relationship of refugee parents to inclusive refugee education. What are the expectations, concerns, and hopes

that refugee parents—and particularly mothers—hold for their children? How do they understand the context of inclusive refugee education and, particularly in the case of students experiencing discrimination in schools, what value do they see in them (if any)? This area of inquiry is undoubtedly impacted by my new identity as a mother, which I believe could be a strength in conducting such a study.

Finally, I believe it is important to extend this research beyond the context of Jordan. It would be valuable to compare practices and experiences of inclusive refugee education in other Middle Eastern contexts, including Lebanon and Turkey as two of the primary refugee hosting countries. Such a comparison could illuminate the ways that different policy contexts and educational contexts take up inclusion as well as the ways that differing sociopolitical factors shape inclusion and the practices of inclusion in schools. Extending the comparison beyond the Middle East would yield additional insights into the ways that students and teachers construct and negotiate the space of inclusive refugee education.

Conclusion

It is difficult to think about concluding this dissertation. A conclusion implies neatly wrapping everything up, tying it off, and marking it as finished. Yet, the stories of the students and teachers in this dissertation remain unfinished and, certainly the need to understand inclusive refugee education is far from over. I hope that through this dissertation, I demonstrated the value of education as a tool to cultivate a sense of inclusion and support to refugee youth. I hope I did so in a way that revealed the tensions and complexities that emerge in the context of inclusion and the ways that student and

teacher actions and attitudes can have very real and often unintended consequences on the inclusion of refugee youth into the school community. As I reflect upon the entirely of this work, I think most about the students who were involved and influenced by the practices of inclusive refugee education. It is my hope that as scholars—myself included—continue to conduct research with refugee youth, as policy makers continue to draft and assess policies that impact refugee youth, and as practitioners continue to provide provisions of education for refugees, we can keep the stories and the lives of these young people central in our minds.

References

Abu Hamad, B.A., Jones, N., Samuels, F., Gercama, I., Presler-Marshall, E., Plank, G., . . . Sadji, J. (2017). A promise of tomorrow: The effects of UNHCR and UNICEF cash assistance on Syrian refugees in Jordan. Retrieved from https://www.odi.org/publications/10978-promise-tomorrow-effects-unhcr-and-unicef-cash-assistance-syrian-refugees-jordan.

Abu el-Haj, T.R. (2016). *Unsettled belonging: Educating Palestinian American youth after 9/11*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Achilli, L. (2015). *Syrian refugees in Jordan: A reality check*. Retrieved from http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/34904/MPC_2015-02_PB.pdf?sequence=1.

Adelman, E. (2018). *Challenges of integration, obligation, and identity: Exploring the experiences of teachers working to educate Syrian refugee children in Lebanon* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/37679890.

Adely, F. (2004). Mixed effects of schooling for high school girls in Jordan: The case of Tel Yahya. *Comparative Education Review, 48*(1), 353-373.

Adely, F. (2010). Performing patriotism: Rituals and moral authority in a Jordanian high school. In A. Mazawi & R. Sultana (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2010: Education and the Arab 'world': Political projects, struggles, and geometries of power* (pp. 132-144). New York, NY: Routledge.

Adely, F. (2012a). *Gendered paradoxes: Educating Jordanian women in nation, faith, and progress.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Adely, F. (2012b). "God made beautiful things": Proper faith and religious authority in a Jordanian high school. *American Ethnologist, 39*(2), 297-312.

Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 21*(2), 166-191.

Agger, B. (1991). Critical theory, poststructuralism, postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. *Annual Review of Sociology, 17*, 105-131.

Aguilar, P., & Retamal, G. (1998). *Rapid educational response in complex emergencies: A discussion document.* New York, NY: UNESCO.

Ahmadzadeh, H., Çorabatır, M., Hashem, L., Al Husseini, J., & Wahby, S. (2014). *Ensuring quality education for young refugees from Syrian (12-25 years): A mapping exercise.* Oxford, UK: Refugee Studies Center, Oxford University.

Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., & Weiner, S. (2014). *From exclusion to inclusion: International literature on ways of responding to students with special educational needs in schools*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED546818.pdf.

Akesson, B. (2015). School as a place of violence and hope: Tensions of education for children and families in post-intifada Palestine. *International Journal of Educational Development, 41*, 192-199.

Al Khatib, B., & Lenner, K. (2015). *Alternative voices on the Syrian refugee crisis in Jordan: An interview collection*. Retrieved from

http://www.rosaluxemburg.ps/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Jordan-Book-ref-English.pdf.

Allaf, C., & Washington, K. (2013). The consequences of status: The schooling of Iraqis in Jordan. In L. Bartlett & A. Ghaffar-Kucher (Eds.), *Refugees, immigrants, and education in the global south: Lives in motion* (pp. 165-179). New York, NY: Routledge.

Amjad, R., Aslan, J., Borgnäs, E., Chandran, D., Clark, E., Ferreira dos Passos, A., . . . Mohajer, O. (2017). *Examining barriers to workforce inclusion of Syrian refugees in Jordan*. (Better Work Discussion Papers; Vol. 25). Retrieved from https://betterwork.org/dev/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/DP-25-Barriers-to-refugee-integration-in-Jordan.pdf.

Amor, A. M., Hagiwara, M., Shogren, K. A., Thompson, J. R., Verdugo, M. Á., Burke, K. M., & Aguayo, V. (2018). International perspectives and trends in research on inclusive education: A systematic review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-19.

Anderson, B. S. (2001). Writing the nation: Textbooks of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East, 21*(1), 5-14.

Anderson, B. S. (2005). *Nationalist voices in Jordan: The street and the state*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (2012). Complicating the concept of culture. *Comparative Education*, *48*(4), 441-454.

Anthias, F. (2006). Belongings in a globalising and unequal world: Rethinking translocations. In N. Yuval-Davis, K. Kannabiran, & U. Vieten (Eds.), *The situated politics of belonging* (pp. 17-31). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Antonsich, M. (2010). Searching for belonging: An analytical framework. *Geography Compass, 4*(6), 644-659. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00317.

Apple, M. W. (1978). Ideology, reproduction, and educational reform. *Comparative Education Review*, *22*(3), 367-387.

Apple, M. W. (1993). The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense?. *Discourse*, *14*(1), 1-16.

Apple, M. W. (2010). Theory, research, and the critical scholar/activist. *Educational Researcher 39*(2), 152-162.

Apple, M. W. (2013). *Knowledge, power, and education: The selected works of Michael W. Apple*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Augustine, H. (2014). Living in a post-coding world: Analysis as assemblage. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20* (6), 747-753.

Bajaj, M. (2009). Why context matters: Understanding the material conditions of school-based caring in Zambia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *22*(4), 379-398.

Bajaj, M., Argenal, A., & Canlas, M. (2017). Socio-politically relevant pedagogy for immigrant and refugee youth. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *50*(3), 258-274.

Bajaj, M., & Bartlett, L. (2017). Critical transnational curriculum for immigrant and refugee students. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *47*(1), 25-35.

Bajaj, M., Canlas, M., & Argenal, A. (2017). Between rights and realities: Human rights education for immigrant and refugee youth in an urban public high school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *48*(2), 124-140.

Bakewell, O. (2008). Research beyond the categories: The importance of policy irrelevant research into forced migration. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *21*(4), 432-453.

Barbelet, V., Hagen-Zanker, J., & Mansour-Ille, D. (2018). *The Jordan Compact: Lessons learnt and implications for future refugee compacts.* London, UK: Overseas Development Institute (ODI).

Barnes, A. E. (2009). *Realizing protection space for Iraqi refugees: UNHCR in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon.* Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service.

Barone, T. (2008). A return to the gold standard? Questioning the future of narrative construction as educational research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *13*(2), 1-17.

Bartlett, L. (2005). Dialogue, knowledge, and teacher-student relations: Freirean pedagogy in theory and practice. *Comparative Education Review*, *49*(3), 344-364.

Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2019). Rethinking the concept of "Context" in comparative education. In R. Gorur, S. Sellar, & G. Steiner-Khamsi (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2019: Comparative methodology in the era of big data and global networks*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bartlett, L., Mendenhall, M., & Ghaffar-Kucher, A. (2017). Culture in acculturation: Refugee youth's schooling experiences in international schools in New York City. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *60*, 109-119.

Bellino, M. J., & Dryden-Peterson, S. (2018). Inclusion and exclusion within a policy of national integration: Refugee education in Kenya's Kakuma Refugee Camp. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1-17.

Bernard, H. (2006). *Research methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (4th ed.). Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Black, R. (2001). Fifty years of refugee studies: From theory to policy. *International Migration Review*, *35*(1), 57-78.

Block, K., Cross, S., Riggs, E., & Gibbs, L. (2014). Supporting schools to create an inclusive environment for refugee students. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *18*(12), 1337-1355.

Bloom, L., & Munro, P. (1995). Conflicts of selves: Nonunitary subjectivity in women administrators' life history narratives. In J. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 99-112). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (2000). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Britzman, D.P. (1995). "The question of belief": Writing poststructural ethnography. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *8*(3), 229-238.

Brown, S. (2009). Dilemmas of self-representation and conduct in the field. In C.L. Sriram, J.C. King, J.A. Mertus, O. Martin-Ortega, & J. Herman (Eds.), *Surviving field research: Working in violent and difficult situations* (pp. 213-226). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bruner, E. (1986). Ethnography as narrative. In V. Turner & E. Bruner (Eds.), *The anthropology of experience* (pp. 139-159). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Buckner, E., & Hodges, R. (2016). Cheating or cheated? Surviving secondary exit exams in a neoliberal era. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *46*(4), 603-623.

Burde, D. (2005). *Education in crisis situations: Mapping the field*. New York, NY: USAID.

Bush, K. D., & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

CARE Jordan. (2014). *Lives unseen: Urban Syrian refugees and Jordanian host communities three years into the crisis*. Retrieved from https://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees.

CARE Jordan. (2015). *Five years into exile: The challenges faced by Syrian refugees outside camps in Jordan and how they and their host communities are coping.* Retrieved from http://www.alnap.org/resource/20591.

Casey, K. (1996) The new narrative research in education. In M.W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education (21).* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Castagno, A. E. (2008). "I don't want to hear that!": Legitimating whiteness through silence in schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *39*(3), 314-333.

Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural development*: *Putting the last first.* New York, NY: Longman Press.

Chatty, D. (2009). Palestinian refugee youth: Agency and aspiration. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, *28*(2-3), 318-338.

Boutieri, C. (2016). *Learning in Morocco: Language politics and the abandoned educational dream*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, J. (2006). Field research methods in the Middle East. *Political Science and Politics*, 39(3), 417-423.

Collet, B. A., & Bang, H. (2016). The securitisation of refugee flows and the schooling of refugees: examining the cases of North Koreans in South Korea and Iraqis in Jordan. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *46*(2), 272-292.

Cornwall, A., & Nyamu-Musembi, C. (2004). Putting the 'rights-based approach' to development into perspective. *Third World Quarterly*, *25*(8), 1415-1437.

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Crisp, J., Talbot, C., & Cipollone, D. B. (2001). *Learning for a future: Refugee education in developing countries*. Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR.

Davies, L. (2004). *Conflict and education: Complexity and chaos*. London, UK: Routledge.

Davies, L. (2010). The different faces of education in conflict. *Development*, *53*(4), 491-497.

Davies, L., & Talbot, C. (2008). Learning in conflict and postconflict contexts. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*(4), 509-518.

Demirdjian, L. (2011). Introduction: Education, refugees, asylum seekers—a global overview. In L. Demirdjian (Ed.), *Education, refugees, asylum seekers: Education as a humanitarian response* (pp. 1-37). New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2003). *Education of refugees in Uganda: Relationship between setting and access*. Kampala, Uganda: Refugee Law Project.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2006a). 'I find myself as someone who is in the forest': Urban refugees as agents of social change in Kampala, Uganda. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *19*(3), 381-395.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2006b). Livelihoods in the region: The present is local, the future is global?: Reconciling current and future livelihood strategies in the education of Congolese refugees in Uganda. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, *25*(2), 81-92.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2011a). *Refugee education: A global review*. Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2011b). Refugee children aspiring toward the future. In K. Mundy & S. Dryden-Peterson (Eds.), *Educating children in conflict zones* (pp. 85-99). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2015a). Refugee education in countries of first asylum: Breaking open the black box of pre-resettlement experiences. *Theory and Research in Education*, *14*(2), 131-148.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2015b). *The educational experiences of refugee children in countries of first asylum*. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/FCD_Dryen-Peterson-FINALWEB.pdf.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016). Refugee education: The crossroads of globalization. *Educational Researcher*, *45*(9), 473-482.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2017). Refugee education: Education for an unknowable future. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *47*(1), 14-24.

Dryden-Peterson, S., Adelman, E., Alvarado, S., Anderson, K., Bellino, M., Brooks, R., . . . Suzuki, E. (2018). *Inclusion of refugees in national education systems.* Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000266054.

Dryden-Peterson, S., Adelman, E., Bellino, M., & Chopra, V. (under review). *The purposes of refugee education: Policy and practice of integrating refugees into national education systems*. Harvard University.

Dryden-Peterson, S., Negin, D., & Adelman, E. (2017). Pathways to educational success among refugees: Connecting locally and globally situated resources. *American Educational Research Journal 54*(6), 1011-1047.

Duncan, J., & Arnston, L. (2004). *Children in crisis: Good practices in evaluating psychosocial programming.* London, UK: Save the Children.

Dyson, A., & Gallannaugh, F. (2007). National policy and the development of inclusive school practices: a case study. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 37*(4), 473-488.

Education Sector Working Group. (2015). *Access to education for Syrian refugee children and youth in Jordan host communities: Joint education needs assessment.* Retrieved from https://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/download.php?id=8570.

Edwards, T. K. (2017). From the editorial board: refugees and inclusive school practices in the face of intolerance. *High School Journal, 100*(4), 223-225.

El-Abed, O. (2014). The discourse of guesthood: Forced migrants in Jordan. In A. Fabos & R. Isotalo (Eds.), *Managing Muslim Mobilities* (pp. 81-100). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ferber, A. L. (2012). The culture of privilege: Color-blindness, postfeminism, and christonormativity. *Journal of Social Issues, 68*(1), 63-77.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., & Sigona, N. (2014). Introduction: Refugee and forced migration studies in transition. In E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, G. Loescher, K. Long, & N. Sigona (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of refugee and forced migration studies* (pp. 1-19). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Fincham, K. (2012). Learning the nation in exile: Constructing youth identities, belonging and 'citizenship' in Palestinian refugee camps in south Lebanon. *Comparative Education, 48*(1), 119-133.

Fine, M., & Weis, L. (2003). *Silenced voices and extraordinary conversations: Re-imagining schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Freier, L. Which refugees deserve our help? How polarized representations shape public opinions and individuals' lives. *Gränsløs. Tidskrift för studier av Öresundsregionens historia, kultur och samhällsliv, 8,* 79-89.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Books.

Freire, P. (2013). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Fuji, L. (2009). Interpreting truth and lies in stories of conflict and violence. In C.L Sriram, J.C. King, J.A. Mertus, O. Martin-Ortega, J. Herman (Eds.), *Surviving field research: Working in violent and difficult situations* (pp. 147-162). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gatrell, P. (2013). *The making of the modern refugee*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Giroux, H. A. (2006). *The Giroux reader*. C. Robbins, (Ed.). Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Glesne, C. (2015). *Becoming qualitative researchers* (5th ed.). Uppser Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Grayson, C. L. (2017). *Children of the camp: The lives of Somali youth raised in Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Greany, K. (2008). Rhetoric versus reality: Exploring the rights-based approach to girls' education in rural Niger. *Compare*, *38*(5), 555-568.

Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (1999). At the border of narrative and ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 28*(5), 561-573.

Guo, S., & Maitra, S. (2017). Revisioning curriculum in the age of transnational mobility: Towards a transnational and transcultural framework. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *47*(1), 80-91.

Hantzopoulos, M., & Shirazi, R. (2014). Securing the state through the production of 'global' citizens: Analyzing neo-liberal educational reforms in Jordan and the USA. *Policy Futures in Education*, *12*(3), 370-386.

Herrera, L. (2003). Islamization and education in Egypt: Between politics, culture, and the market. In J. Esposito & F. Burgat (Eds.), *Modernizing Islam: Religion in the public sphere in Europe and the Middle East* (pp. 167-185). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Herrera, L. (2006). Islamization and education: Between politics, profit and pluralism. In L. Herrera & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Cultures of Arab schooling: Critical ethnographies from Egypt* (pp. 25-53). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Herrera, L. (2010). Education and ethnography: Insiders, outsiders, and gatekeepers. In A. Mazawi & R. Sultana (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2010: education and the Arab 'world': political projects, struggles, and geometries of power* (pp. 117-131). New York, NY: Routledge.

Herrera, L., & Torres, C. A. (2006). Introduction: Possibilities for critical education in the Arab world. In L. Herrera & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Cultures of Arab schooling: Critical ethnographies from Egypt* (pp. 1-25). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hett, G., & Hett, J. (2013). Ethics in intercultural research: Reflections on the challenges of conducting field research in a Syrian context. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(4), 496-515.

Hopkins, L. (2009). Why narrative? Reflections on the politics and processes of using narrative in refugee research. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science, 8*(8.2), 135-145.

Hos, R. (2016). Caring is not enough: Teachers' enactment of ethical care for adolescent students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE) in a newcomer classroom. *Education and Urban Society*, *48*(5), 479-503.

Hovil, L. (2016). *Refugees, conflict and the search for belonging*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hunt, A., Samman, E., & Mansour-Ille, D. (2017). *Syrian women refugees: Opportunity in the gig economy?* Retrieved from https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11742.pdf.

Inkeles, A. (1998). *One world emerging? Convergence and divergence in industrial societies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Interagency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2010a). *Minimum standards for education in emergencies, chronic crises and early reconstruction.* Retrieved from http://toolkit.ineesite.org/inee_minimum_ standards.

Interagency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2010b). *Guidance notes on teaching and learning.* Retrieved from https://toolkit.ineesite.org/guidance_notes_on_teaching_and_learning.

Interagency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2015). *Jordan: Minimum standards for education: Contextualized from INEE Minimum Standards for Education.* Retrieved from https://toolkit.ineesite.org/resources/ineecms/uploads/1154/INEE-English_18_June__2015_9_(online)_(1).pdf.

International Rescue Committee (IRC). (2017). *In search of work: Creating jobs for Syrian refugees*. Retrieved from https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/1343/insearchofworkweb.pdf.

International Rescue Committee (IRC). (2018). *Still in search of work - creating jobs for Syrian refugees: An update on the Jordan compact*. Retrieved from https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/2686/stillinsearchofworkjordancompactupdatebriefapril2018.pdf.

Jacobsen, K., & Landau, L. B. (2003). The dual imperative in refugee research: Some methodological and ethical considerations in social science research on forced migration. *Disasters, 27*(3), 185-206.

Jalbout, M. (2015). *Opportunities for accelerating progress on education for Syrian children and youth in Jordan.* London, UK: Theirworld.

Johnson, G. (2013). There is violence either way so let violence come with an education: Southern Sudanese refugee women's use of education for an imagined peaceful future. In L. Bartlett & A. Ghaffar-Kucher (Eds.), *Refugees, immigrants, and education in the global south: Lives in motion* (pp. 70-84). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, K. (2013). Education for migrant children along the Thailand-Burma border: Governance and governmentality in a global policyscape context. In L. Bartlett & A. Ghaffar-Kucher (Eds.), *Refugees, immigrants, and education in the global south: Lives in motion* (pp. 149-164). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jordan INGO Forum (JIF). (2018). Syrian refugees in Jordan: A protection overview. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/JIF-ProtectionBrief-2017-Final.pdf.

Kagawa, F. (2005). Emergency education: A critical review of the field. *Comparative Education, 41*(4), 487-503.

Karanja, L. (2010). The educational pursuits and obstacles for urban refugee students in Kenya. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education, 1*(3), 1-9.

Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2002). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In P.F. Carspecken, P. Gilmore, & D. Foley (Eds.), *Ethnography and schools: Qualitative approaches to the study of education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kincheloe, J., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 163-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

King, J. (2009). Demystifying field research. In C.L Sriram, J.C. King, J.A. Mertus, O. Martin-Ortega, & J. Herman (Eds.), *Surviving field research: Working in violent and difficult situations* (pp. 8-18). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kirk, J., & Winthrop, R. (2007). Promoting quality education in refugee contexts: Supporting teacher development in Northern Ethiopia. *International Review of Education, 53*(5-6), 715-723.

Kirk, J., & Winthrop, R. (2009). Moving from innovation to policy: IRC's work with community-based education in Afghanistan. *Opportunities For Change: Education Innovation and Reform during and After Conflict*, 103-114.

Krafft, C., Sieverding, M., Salemi, C., & Keo, C. (2018). *Syrian Refugees in Jordan: Demographics, Livelihoods, Education, and Health* (Economic Research Forum Working Paper No. 1184). Retrieved from https://ideas.repec.org/p/erg/wpaper/1184.html.

Kubow, P. K. (2010). Constructing citizenship in Jordan: Global and local influences shaping the national narrative in the Education Reform for Knowledge Economy (ERfKE) Era. *World Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7-20.

Kubow, P., & Kreishan, L. (2014). Citizenship in a hybrid state: Civic curriculum in Jordan's education reform for knowledge economy era. *Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research*, *13*(4), 5-20.

Lenner, K. (2016). *Blasts from the past: Policy legacies and memories in the making of the Jordanian response to the Syrian refugee crisis*. (EUI Working Papers, Max Weber Red Number Series; Vol. 2016, No. 32). European University Institute.

Lenner, K., & Schmelter, S. (2016). Syrian refugees in Jordan and Lebanon: Between refuge and ongoing deprivation. *IEMed Mediterranean Yearbook*, 122-126.

Lenner, K., & Turner, L. (2018). Making refugees work? The politics of integrating Syrian refugees into the labor market in Jordan. *Middle East Critique*, 1-31.

Levinson, B. (2011). Introduction: Exploring critical social theories and education. In B. Levinson, J. Gross, C. Hanks, J. Heimer Dadds, K. Kumasi, & J. Link (Eds.), *Beyond critique: Exploring critical social theories and education* (pp. 1-24). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Levinson, B.A., Foley, D.E., & Holland, D.C. (1996). *The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Levinson, B. A., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power: Theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options. *Educational Policy*, *23*(6), 767-795.

Loughry, M., & Eyber, C. (2003). *Psychosocial concepts in humanitarian work with children: A review of the concepts and related literature.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Lozenski, B. (2014). *Developing a critical eye (I), chasing a critical we: Intersections of participatory action research, crisis, and the education of black youth* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11299/167260.

Luttrell, W. (2000). " Good enough" methods for ethnographic research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *70*(4), 499-523.

Maadad, N., & Matthews, J. (2018). Schooling Syrian refugees in Lebanon: Building hopeful futures. *Educational Review*, 1-16.

Machel, G. (1996). *Promotion and protection of the rights of children: Impact of armed conflict on children.* New York, NY: United Nations.

Madison, D. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, and performance.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Magee, A., & Pherali, T. (2017). Freirean critical consciousness in a refugee context: a case study of Syrian refugees in Jordan. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 1-17.

Malkki, L. H. (1995). Refugees and exile: From "refugee studies" to the national order of things. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *24*(1), 495-523.

Mason, V. (2011). The Im/mobilities of Iraqi refugees in Jordan: Pan-Arabism, "hospitality" and the figure of the "refugee." *Mobilities*, *6*(3), 353–373.

Massad, J. (2001). *Colonial effects: The making of national identity in Jordan.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Mazawi, A. E. (1999). The contested terrains of education in the Arab states: An appraisal of major research trends. *Comparative Education Review, 43*(3), 332-352.

Mazawi, A. E. (2002). Educational expansion and the mediation of discontent: The cultural politics of schooling in the Arab states. *Discourse*, *23*(1), 59-74.

Mazawi, A. E. (2010). Naming the imaginary: "Building an Arab knowledge society" and the contested terrain of educational reforms for development. In O. Abi-Mershed (Ed.), *Trajectories of education in the Arab world: Legacies and challenges* (pp. 201-225). New York, NY: Routledge.

McAdams, D. (2008). Personal narratives and the life story. In O. John, R. Robins, & L. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 242-264). New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Mendenhall, M., Bartlett, L., & Ghaffar-Kucher, A. (2017). "If you need help, they are always there for us": Education for refugees in an international high school in NYC. *The Urban Review*, *49*(1), 1-25.

Mendenhall, M., Dryden-Peterson, S., Bartlett, L., Ndirangu, C., Imonje, R., Gakunga, D., . . . Tangelder, M. (2015). Quality education for refugees in Kenya: Pedagogy in urban Nairobi and Kakuma refugee camp settings. *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, *1*(1), 92-130.

Meshulam, A., & Apple, M. W. (2010). Israel/Palestine, unequal power, and movements for democratic education. *Global Crises, Social Justice, and Education*, 113-161.

Messiou, K. (2017). Research in the field of inclusive education: time for a rethink?. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *21*(2), 146-159.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ministry of Education. (2004a). *Integrative curriculum: Level two.* Amman, Jordan: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2004b). *Integrative curriculum: Level three*. Amman, Jordan: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Planning and Cooperation (MOPIC). (2014). *National resilience plan.* Retrieved from http://inform.gov.jo/en-us/By-Date/Report-Details/ArticleId/26/2014-2016-National-Resilience-Plan.

Ministry of Planning and Cooperation (MOPIC). (2015). *Jordan response plan for the Syria crisis: 2015*. Retreieved from http://www.jo.undp.org/content/dam/jordan/docs/Publications/JRP+Final+Draft+2014.12.17.pdf.

Ministry of Planning and Cooperation (MOPIC). (2016). *Jordan response plan for the Syria crisis: 2016-2018.* Retrieved from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/522c2552e4b0d3c39ccd1e00/t/56b9abe107eaa0afdcb35f02/1455008783181/JRP%2B2016-2018%2BFull%2B160209.pdf.

Ministry of Planning and Cooperation (MOPIC). (2017). *Jordan response plan for the Syria crisis: 2017-2019.* Retrieved from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/522c2552e4b0d3c39ccd1e00/t/584d2f2c9f7456bbff504f72/1481453408358/JRP+2017-2019+-+Full+Plan+-+Submission+Draft+1+-+PDF.pdf.

Moulin, C. (2012). Ungrateful subjects? Refugee protests and the logic of gratitude. In P. Nyers & K. Rygiel (Eds.), *Citizenship, migrant activism and the politics of movement* (pp. 66-84). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nicolai, S., Hine, S., & Wales, J. (2015). *Education in emergencies and protracted crises: Towards a strengthened response.* Retrieved from http://www.odi.org/publications/9688-education-emergencies-protracted-crises-toward-strengthened-response.

Nicolai, S., & Triplehorn, C. (2003). *The role of education in protecting children in conflict*. Retrieved from http://odihpn.org/resources/the-role-of-education-in-protecting-children-in-conflict.

No Lost Generation. (2016). *Syria crisis education strategic paper*. Retrieved from http://www.oosci-mena.org/uploads/1/wysiwyg/160128_UNICEF_MENARO_Syria_policy_paper_final.pdf.

Noddings, Nel. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, Nel. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. *American Journal of Education, 96*(2), 215–31.

Noddings, Nel. (1994). Conversation as moral education. *Journal of Moral Education, 23*(2), 107-118.

Noddings, Nel. (2005). Identifying and responding to needs in education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 35*(2), 147-159.

Norman, J. (2009). Got trust? The challenge of gaining access in conflict zones. In C. L. Sriram, J.C. King, J.A. Mertus, O. Martin-Ortega, & J. Herman (Eds.), *Surviving field research: Working in violent and difficult situations* (pp. 71-90). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nyers, P. (1999). Emergency or emerging identities? Refugees and transformations in world order. *Millennium Journal of International Studies, 28,* 1-26.

Oh, S. A., & Van Der Stouwe, M. (2008). Education, diversity, and inclusion in Burmese refugee camps in Thailand. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*(4), 589-617.

Olagookun, O., & White, J. (2017). Including students from refugee backgrounds in Australian schools. In V. Plows & B. Whitburn (Eds.), *Inclusive education: Making sense of everyday practice* (pp. 95-105). Rotterdam, Netherlands: SensePublishers.

Ong, A. (1996). Cultural citizenship as subject-making: immigrants negotiate racial and cultural oundaries in the United States. *Current anthropology*, *37*(5), 737-762.

Parkinson, S. (2014). Practical ethics: How U.S. law and the 'war on terror' affect research in the Middle East. *POMEPS Studies, 8*, 24-26. Retrieved from https://pomeps.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/POMEPS_Studies_8_Ethics.pdf.

Peacock, J. (2001). *The anthropological lens: Harsh light, soft focus* (2nd ed.) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pherali, T., & Turner, E. (2018). Meanings of education under occupation: the shifting motivations for education in Palestinian refugee camps in the West Bank. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *39*(4), 567-589.

Pigozzi, M. J. (1999). *Education in emergencies and for reconstruction: a developmental approach.* Retrieved from http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1506/Pigozzi,_M._J._1999_UNICEF_Working_paper_series.pdf.

Polkinghorne, D. (1995). Narrative configuration as qualitative analysis. In J. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 5-25). New York, NY: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T. (1999). Critical traditions, modernisms, and the "posts." In T. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics* (pp. 1-17). New York, NY: Routledge.

Questscope for Social Development in the Middle East. (2011). *Strengthening youth opportunities: A pilot impact and process study of empowerment-based non-formal education for out-of-school youth in Amman, Jordan.* Retreived from http://www.questscope.org/sites/default/files/documents/Attachment%205%20-%20B-%20Oxford_s%20Impact%20Study-Stakeholder%20Report-2011.pdf.

Radsch, C. (2009). From cell phones to coffee: Issues of access in Egypt and Lebanon. In C.L Sriram, J.C. King, J.A. Mertus, O. Martin-Ortega, & J. Herman (Eds.), *Surviving field research: Working in violent and difficult situations* (pp. 91-107). New York, NY: Routledge.

Raucher, M. S. (2013). *(Re)producing ethics and the ethics of reproduction: Reproductive ethics among Haredi women in Jerusalem* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations.

REACH Initiative. (2015). *Access to education for Syrian refugee children and youth in Jordanian host communities*. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/REACH_JENA_HC_March2015_.pdf.

Richards, D. (1996). Elite interviewing: Approaches and pitfalls. *Politics, 16*(3), 199-204.

Richardson, E., MacEwen, L., & Naylor, R. (2018). *Teachers of refugees: A review of the literature.* United Kingdom: Education Development Trust.

Richardson, L., & St Pierre, E. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 959-978). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Robins, P. (2004). *A history of Jordan.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Roggeman, K., & Shukri, M. (2010). Active-learning pedagogies as a reform initiative: The case of Jordan. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.176.5133&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Rosaldo, R. (1994). Cultural citizenship and educational democracy. *Cultural anthropology, 9*(3), 402- 411.

Rutinwa, B. (2002). Prima facie status and refugee protection. *New Issues in Refugee, Research (69),* p. 1-27.

Salem, H. (2018.) *The voices of reason: Learning from Syrian refugee students in Jordan*. Retrieved from https://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/centres/real/downloads/REAL%20Policy%20Brief%20Syrian%20Refugee%20Student%20A4_FINAL.pdf

Save the Children. (1996). *Promoting psychosocial well being among children affected by armed conflict and displacement: principles and approaches.* Retrieved from http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/sites/default/files/documents/3019.pdf.

Save the Children. (2008). *Delivering education for children in emergencies: A key building block for the future.* Retrieved from http://www.savethechildren.org/atf/cf/%7B9def2ebe-10ae-432c-9bd0-df91d2eba74a%7D/DELIVERING_EDUCATION_EMERGENCIES.PDF.

Schmidt, A. (2007). 'I know what you're doing': Reflexivity and methods in refugee studies. *Refugee Survey Quarterly, 26*(3), 82-99.

Schram, T. (2003). *Conceptualizing and proposing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Schuelka, M., Johnstone, C., Thomas, G., & Artiles, A. (in press). Introduction: Diversity and inclusion in education: Inclusive education scholarship in the twenty-first century. In *The SAGE Handbook of Inclusion and Diversity in Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Schwandt, T. (1998). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 221-259). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing.

Sesnan, B., Allemano, E. P., Ndugga, H., & Said, S. (2013). *Educators in exile: The role and status of refugee teachers*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Shabaneh, G. (2012). Education and identity: The role of UNRWA's education programs in the reconstruction of Palestinian nationalism. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 25*(4), 491-513.

Shirazi, R. (2009). *Molding the knights of change: National identity, schooling, and masculinity in two Jordanian high schools for boys* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations.

Shirazi, R. (2012). Performing the 'knights of change': Male youth narratives and practices of citizenship in Jordanian schools. *Comparative Education, 48*(1), 71-85.

Shirazi, R. (2014). The pedagogy of visibility: constructs and contests of Iranianness in a community-organized school in a large southern US City. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 8*(2), 108-124. doi: 10.1080/15595692.2013.857302.

Shirazi, R. (2016). 'These boys are wild:' Constructions and contests of masculinities at two Jordanian high schools. *Gender and Education, 28*(1), 89-107. doi: 10.1080/09540253.2015.1081877.

Shirazi, R. (2018). Between hosts and guests: Conditional hospitality and citizenship in an American suburban school. *Curriculum Inquiry, 48*(1), 95-114.

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (Eds.). (1997). *Anthropology of policy: Perspectives on governance and power*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sidhu, R., Taylor, S., & Christie, P. (2011). Schooling and refugees: Engaging with the complex trajectories of globalisation. *Global Studies of Childhood, 1*(2), 92-103.

Sinclair, M. (2001). Education in emergencies. In J. Crisp, C. Talbot, & D. Cipolline (Eds.), *Learning for a future: Refugee education in developing countries* (pp. 1–83). Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR.

Sinclair, M. (2002). *Planning education in and after emergencies.* Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/iiep/PDF/Fund73.pdf.

Sobe, N. W., & Kowalczyk, J. (2012). The problem of context in comparative education research. *Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies, 3*(6), 55-74.

Sobe, N. W., & Kowalczyk, J. A. (2013). Exploding the cube: Revisioning "Context" in the field of comparative education. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 16*(1), 6-12.

Spaaij, R. (2015). Refugee youth, belonging and community sport. *Leisure Studies, 34*(3), 303-318.

Sparkes, A. (1994). Life histories and the issue of voice: Reflections on an emerging relationship. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 7*(2), 165-183.

Stabe, S. E., Tiltnes, A. A., Khalil, Z., & Husseini, J. (2017). *Improving learning environments in Jordanian public schools: Lessons from school visits and community dialogue in Northern Jordan.* Retrieved from https://ardd-jo.org/sites/default/files/resource-files/improving_learning_environments_in_jordanian_public_schools.compressed_12_0.pdf.

Starrett, G. (1998). *Putting Islam to work: education, politics, and religious transformation in Egypt*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Stivers, C. (1993). Reflections on the role of personal narrative in social science. *Signs 18*(2), 408-425.

Sutton, M., & Levinson, B. A. (2001). *Policy as practice: Toward a comparative sociocultural analysis of educational policy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Talbot, C. (2013). *Education in conflict emergencies in light of the post-2015 MDGs and EFA agendas*. Geneva, Switzerland: NORRAG.

Taylor, S., & Sidhu, R. K. (2012). Supporting refugee students in schools: What constitutes inclusive education?. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *16*(1), 39-56.

Thomas, J. (1993). *Doing critical ethnograph*y. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412983945.

Thomson, P. (2013, March 11). Re: Do we 'collect' data? or—beware the ontological slip [web log message]. Retrieved from http://patthomson.wordpress.com/2013/03/11/do-we-collect-data-or-is-your-ontological-slip-showing.

United Nations. (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml.

United Nations. (1951). *Convention relating to the status of refugees*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10.html.

United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child.* Retrieved from http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx.

United Nations. (2016). *Sustainable development goals report 2016*. Retrieved from http://ggim.un.org/documents/The%20Sustainable%20Development%20Goals%20Report%202016.pdf.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP) & United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2015). *Regional refugee and resilience plan 2015-2016, in response to the Syria crisis: Regional strategic overview.* Retrieved from http://www.3rpsyriacrisis.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/3RP-Report-Overview.pdf.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP) & United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2016). *Regional refugee and resilience plan 2016-2017, in response to the Syria crisis: Regional strategic overview.* Retrieved from http://www.3rpsyriacrisis.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/3RP-Regional-Overview-2016-2017.pdf.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP) & United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2017). *Regional refugee and resilience plan 2017-2018, in response to the Syria crisis: Regional strategic overview*. Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/partners/donors/589497237/2017-2018-regional-refugee-resilience-plan-response-syria-crisis-12-december.html.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (n.d.) Education Working Group: Jordan [Webpage]. Retrieved from https://data2.unhcr.org/en/working-group/45. (**ch 4)

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2007, June). *Education strategy 2007-2009: Policy, challenges, and objectives*. Retrieved from http://www.refworld.org/docid/469201e72.html.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2012). *2012-2016 education strategy.* Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/5149ba349.html.
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2017a). *Global trends: Forced displacement in 2016.* Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/5943e8a34.pdf. (**chapter 8)
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2017b). *Education sector quarterly report: April 2017-June 2017*. Retrieved from https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/59361.
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2018a). *Global trends: Forced displacement in 2017.* Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/statistics/unhcrstats/5b27be547/unhcr-global-trends-2017.html.
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2018b). *Turn the tide: Refugee education in crisis*. Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/turnthetide.
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2019). *Fact sheet: Jordan*. Retrieved from http://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/UNHCR%20Jordan%20Fact%20Sheet%20-%20January%202019.pdf.
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2010). *The situation of Palestinian children in The Occupied Palestinian Territory, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon: An assessment based on the Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/oPt/PALESTINIAN_SITAN-final.pdf.
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Jordan. (2013). *Syrian refugee children in Jordan: Assessments desk review on the situation of Syrian refugee children living in Jordan.* Retrieved from https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/180-syrian-refugee-children-in-jordan-desk-review.pdf.
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Jordan. (2017). *Education*. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/jordan/2_Education_-_2017_ForWEB.pdf.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1990). *World declaration on education for all*. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127583_eng.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127583.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2017). *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and framework for action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4*. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245656.
Uvin, P. (2004). On high moral ground: The incorporation of human rights by the development enterprise. *Praxis, 17,* 1-12.
Uvin, P. (2007). From the right to development to the rights-based approach: How 'human rights' entered development. *Development in Practice, 17*(4), 597-606.
Verme, P., Chiara, G., Wieser, C., Hedlund, K., Petzoldt, M., & Santacroce, M. (2016). *The welfare of Syrian refugees: Evidence from Jordan and Lebanon.* Retrieved from http://www-

wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/T_MNA/2016/01/04/090224b08400c4eb/1_0/Rendered/PDF/The0welfare0of0m0Jordan0and0Lebanon.pdf

Walton, J., Priest, N., Kowal, E., White, F., Brickwood, K., Fox, B., & Paradies, Y. (2014). Talking culture? Egalitarianism, color-blindness and racism in Australian elementary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *39*, 112-122.

Waters, T., & LeBlanc, K. (2005). Refugees and education: Mass public schooling without a nation-state. *Comparative Education Review*, *49*(2), 129-147.

Willemsen, L. (2016). *Embodying empowerment: Gender, schooling, relationships and life history in Tanzania* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy.

Winthrop, R., & Kirk, J. (2008). Learning for a bright future: Schooling, armed conflict, and children's well-being. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*(4), 639-661.

Wolcott, F. (2008). *Ethnography: A way of seeing.* Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

World Bank (2018). Jordan's economic outlook—April 2018. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/jordan/publication/economic-outlook-april-2018

Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F., & Kofman, E. (2005). Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *28*(3), 513-535.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, *40*(3), 197-214.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2011). *The politics of belonging: Intersectional contestations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Zaiotti, R. (2006). Dealing with non-Palestinian refugees in the Middle East: Policies and practices in an uncertain environment. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, *18*(2), 333-353.

Zetter, R. (1991). Labelling refugees: Forming and transforming a bureaucratic identity. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *4*(1), 39-62.

Zetter, R. (2007). More labels, fewer refugees: Remaking the refugee label in an era of globalization. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *20*(2), 172-192.